

COORDINATION AMONG FEDERAL YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

HEARING

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

July 12, 2005

Serial No. 109-24

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/house>
or
Committee address: <http://edworkforce.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

22-399 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2005

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800
Fax: (202) 512-2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	George Miller, California
Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, California	Dale E. Kildee, Michigan
Michael N. Castle, Delaware	Major R. Owens, New York
Sam Johnson, Texas	Donald M. Payne, New Jersey
Mark E. Souder, Indiana	Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey
Charlie Norwood, Georgia	Robert C. Scott, Virginia
Vernon J. Ehlers, Michigan	Lynn C. Woolsey, California
Judy Biggert, Illinois	Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Todd Russell Platts, Pennsylvania	Carolyn McCarthy, New York
Patrick J. Tiberi, Ohio	John F. Tierney, Massachusetts
Ric Keller, Florida	Ron Kind, Wisconsin
Tom Osborne, Nebraska	Dennis J. Kucinich, Ohio
Joe Wilson, South Carolina	David Wu, Oregon
Jon C. Porter, Nevada	Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
John Kline, Minnesota	Susan A. Davis, California
Marilyn N. Musgrave, Colorado	Betty McCollum, Minnesota
Bob Inglis, South Carolina	Danny K. Davis, Illinois
Cathy McMorris, Washington	Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Kenny Marchant, Texas	Chris Van Hollen, Maryland
Tom Price, Georgia	Tim Ryan, Ohio
Luis G. Fortuño, Puerto Rico	Timothy H. Bishop, New York
Bobby Jindal, Louisiana	John Barrow, Georgia
Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Louisiana	
Virginia Foxx, North Carolina	
Thelma D. Drake, Virginia	
John R. "Randy" Kuhl, Jr., New York	

Paula Nowakowski, *Staff Director*
Mark Zuckerman, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION

PATRICK J. TIBERI, Ohio, *Chairman*

Cathy McMorris, Washington <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Mark E. Souder, Indiana	Danny K. Davis, Illinois
Jon C. Porter, Nevada	Chris Van Hollen, Maryland
Bob Inglis, South Carolina	Tim Ryan, Ohio
Luis P. Fortuño, Puerto Rico	George Miller, California, <i>ex officio</i>
John A. Boehner, Ohio, <i>ex officio</i>	

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on July 12, 2005	1
Statement of Members:	
Davis, Hon. Danny K., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois	5
Tiberi, Hon. Patrick J., Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Education, Committee on Education and the Workforce	1
Prepared statement of	2
Osborne, Hon. Tom, a Representative in Congress from the State of Nebraska	2
Prepared statement of	4
Statement of Witnesses:	
Moore, Richard G., Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Planning Division, Iowa Department of Human Rights, Des Moines, IA	22
Prepared statement of	24
O'Grady, Dr. Michael J., Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evalua- tion, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC	6
Prepared statement of	8
Sallee, Marguerite, President and CEO, America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth, Washington, DC	42
Prepared statement of	45
Shubilla, Laura, President, Philadelphia Youth Network, Philadelphia, PA	27
Prepared statement of	29
Steinberg, Dr. Laurence, Distinguished University Professor, Director, MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA	47
Prepared statement of	49

COORDINATION AMONG FEDERAL YOUTH DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

**Tuesday, July 12, 2005
U.S. House of Representatives
Subcommittee on Select Education
Committee on Education and the Workforce
Washington, DC**

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Patrick Tiberi [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Tiberi, McMorris, Osborne, Porter, Inglis, Fortuno, Davis, and Ryan.

Staff Present: Kevin Frank, professional staff member; Lucy House, legislative assistant; Alexa Marrero, press secretary; Krisann Pearce, deputy director of education and human resources policy; Whitney Rhoades, professional staff member; Deborah Samantar, clerk; Kevin Smith, communications director; Denise Forte, legislative associate/education; Ricardo Martinez, legislative associate/education; and Joe Novotny, legislative assistant/education.

Chairman TIBERI. A quorum being present, the Subcommittee on Select Education of the Committee on Education and the Workforce will come to order.

We are meeting today to hear testimony on the coordination among Federal youth development programs.

Under Committee Rule 12(b), opening statements are limited to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee. Therefore, if other Members have statements, they may be included in the hearing record.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the hearing record remain open for 14 days to allow Member statements and other materials referenced here during the hearing to be submitted in the official hearing record.

Without objection, so ordered.

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI, CHAIRMAN, SUB- COMMITTEE ON SELECT EDUCATION, COMMITTEE ON EDU- CATION AND THE WORKFORCE

Good morning and welcome. Thank you all for being here today.

I want to thank our witnesses, both panels, for taking time to appear before the Subcommittee today on relatively short notice, to

share your insights and your experience regarding issues surrounding Federal youth development programs, and offer suggestions as to where this Congress can go to assist the efficient and effective operation of these programs.

I look forward to the testimony from all of you.

At this time, I would like to recognize my friend and colleague, Congressman Tom Osborne, for an opening statement. I will yield my time to him. It is a pleasure to have him join us on the Select Education Subcommittee today.

We came to Congress together in 2000, shared space next to each other on the fifth floor of the Cannon Building. I have great respect for the Coach on many levels, and thank you for your involvement in this issue. I yield to you as much time as you may consume.

[The prepared statement of the Honorable Patrick J. Tiberi follows:]

Statement of Hon. Patrick J. Tiberi, Chairman, Subcommittee on Select Education, Committee on Education and the Workforce

Good morning and welcome. Thank you all for being here today.

I want to thank our witnesses for taking the time to appear before the subcommittee today, on relatively short notice, to share insights and experiences regarding issues surrounding federal youth development programs, and offer suggestions as to where Congress can assist the efficient and effective operation of these programs.

I look forward to your testimony.

At this time, I would like to recognize my friend and colleague, Coach Tom Osborne. It is my pleasure to have him join us on the Select Education Subcommittee today.

I first had the privilege to work with Coach as part of the same freshman class, and as neighbors on the 5th floor of the Cannon House Office Building.

I have a great respect for Coach on many levels and I commend his leadership on the topic of our hearing today—coordination among federal youth development programs. And hearing no objection, I would like to yield my remaining time to Mr. Osborne for a statement.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am still on the fifth floor and you have moved on to better things, I guess.

[Laughter.]

STATEMENT OF HON. TOM OSBORNE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Mr. OSBORNE. I thank you for allowing me to sit in on this Committee, and I'm obviously not a Member of the Committee, Subcommittee.

The genesis of today's hearing is the report of the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth, which was issued in December 2003.

Among other things, the report said the following: roughly one-fourth of U.S. adolescents are at risk of not achieving productive adulthood. I think everyone realizes that we have a great deal of dysfunction, family dysfunction. We have problems with drugs and alcohol. We have violence. We have promiscuity issues.

A great number of young people are not doing very well at the present time.

There are many Federal programs designed to help vulnerable young people, roughly 150. That's a rough figure. It is an awful lot

of them. There is obviously concern on the part of the Federal Government to help disadvantaged youth.

However, there is little rigorous examination of the effectiveness of these programs. Few have quantifiable clear goals.

There is considerable overlap and duplication of these programs, which is spread over roughly 12 different Federal agencies. Many of the programs have evolved into initiatives which has strayed far from the intent of the initial authorizing legislation.

In many cases, program managers are prevented from communicating with other managers of similar programs by statute. They can't legally even coordinate.

We think this needs to be addressed. The Government Accountability Office report of 1997 calls the Federal response to youth failure a perfect example of, and I quote, "mission fragmentation."

The GAO recommends that programs with similar goals, target populations and services be coordinated, consolidated, or streamlined, and that's what our proposed legislation attempts to do.

A large number of youth serving groups approached me, Congressman Hoekstra, Congressman Ford and Payne, to introduce legislation based on recommendations of the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth.

I will just take a couple more minutes to describe the basic nuts and bolts of this Act.

The Federal Youth Coordination Act creates the Federal Youth Development Council, and this would include members of 16 youth serving agencies, as well as disadvantaged youths themselves. We think it is important that we have young people who are in the system, who are in some cases not being served well, also be on the Council to provide input.

The duties of the Council are as follows: No. 1, evaluate youth serving programs. No. 2, coordinate among Federal agencies with youth serving programs.

No. 3, improve Federal programs that serve at risk youth, such as foster care, homeless, educationally challenged young people, and so on.

No. 4, recommend ways to coordinate and improve programs in an annual report.

Right now, there is no annual written document that has anything to do with how well these programs are doing.

I think maybe the last two points are the most important. No. 5, set quantifiable goals and objectives for Federal youth programs and develop a plan to reach these goals.

In other words, each one of these programs should have measurable, quantifiable goals with a plan to hit the goal. If you don't know what the target is, you are not going to hit it. If you don't have a plan to get there, you will not reach it.

This legislation requires these agencies to go through this process and to do these things.

No. 6, hold Federal agencies accountable for achieving results. Accountability in Government many times is lacking. We think this legislation serves a very definite purpose. The objective is to serve more young people more efficiently than we currently do, and we think this will do this.

I might mention that the administration certainly has done some good things, and they are attempting to address some of these problems, but Administrations come and go. We need continuity.

Certainly, there are many things that are not currently being done even under this administration, which is attempting to do some of the things that were reported by the Task Force.

Last, let me just say this. There are 185 organizations supporting this legislation. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to submit a list of those organizations for the record, and with that, I yield back.

[The prepared statement of the Honorable Tom Osborne follows:]

Statement of Hon. Tom Osborne, a Representative in Congress from the State of Nebraska

Mr. Chairman,

I want to thank you for allowing me to join your Subcommittee for today's very important hearing on federal youth development and coordination efforts. I have long advocated for a stronger emphasis at the federal level on youth development programming because I believe it is critically important in order to help our young people grow up to be healthy and strong.

The genesis of today's hearing is in the report of the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth. Although the final report was issued several years ago, I believe that the Task Force report and its thoughtful analysis and recommendations deserve a hearing and discussion in Congress. Although the Executive Branch is charged with implementing youth programs, Congress creates many of these programs and funds them. We need to know that our efforts are producing the best results for young people in the United States.

The White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth noted a number of facts about America's young people and the programs that serve them:

- The National Academy of Sciences estimates that one-quarter of adolescents in this country—almost 10 million teens—are at serious risk of not achieving productive adulthood.
- Most young people will grow up just fine without government involvement, but that the most vulnerable young people may be missed by programs designed to help them. Worse, the programs we think will help them may, in fact, not and that there is a serious lack of rigorous evaluation of federal youth efforts.
- A large number of youth-serving programs are targeting large numbers of youth subgroups. These services and target populations often overlap.
- The current federal response to youth failure is convoluted and complex, and is a perfect example of what the GAO has called "mission fragmentation." The GAO recommends that programs with similar goals, target populations, and services be coordinated, consolidated, or streamlined as appropriate, to ensure that goals are consistent and that program efforts are mutually reinforcing.

The White House Task Force identified a number of goals and changes that, if implemented, would help to better coordinate the hundreds of programs across 12 federal departments that serve or at least partially serve youth. The three largest youth-serving agencies are the Departments of Health and Human Services, Justice, and Education.

To support these efforts, in February of this year, I, along with my colleagues Mr. Hoekstra, Mr. Ford, and Mr. Payne, introduced H.R. 856, the Federal Youth Coordination Act, which was crafted to help implement many of the recommendations of the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth.

The Federal Youth Coordination Act creates the Federal Youth Development Council to evaluate, coordinate, and improve federal youth serving programs and hold federal agencies accountable for achieving results.

The duties of the Council include:

- Evaluating youth serving programs
- Coordinating among federal agencies with programs serving youth
- Improving federal programs that serve at-risk youth
- Recommending ways to coordinate and improve youth serving programs in an annual report on federal youth development programs
- Setting quantifiable goals and objectives for federal youth programs and developing a plan to reach these goals
- Holding federal agencies accountable for achieving results.

America's young people deserve high quality, effective, and meaningful youth development programs. Our nation's taxpayers deserve their tax dollars to be spent

on high-quality, effective and meaningful youth development programs. The Federal Youth Coordination Act addresses the disconnect between these two objectives.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing me to join your Subcommittee today and to give this opening statement. I would like to thank all the witnesses and the youth development advocates who have supported this hearing. I am very much looking forward to hearing from our witnesses and moving forward with efforts to improve federal youth development activities.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Thank you for your leadership, Coach Osborne, on this issue.

Unfortunately, our Ranking Member is stuck in Texas because of bad weather, but we have a pretty good fill in for Representative Hinojosa, so I will recognize Mr. Davis for an opening statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. DANNY K. DAVIS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I certainly hope that the weather will change so that the Ranking Member can in fact get here this week. He is indeed stuck deep in the heart of Texas. I am pleased to fill in for him.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling for this hearing today. I also thank each one of our witnesses for taking the time to come to Washington to testify.

Many times in our national discussions and debates, we discuss the poor, the young, the old, the sick, the unemployed, but often times we forget about the middle. That is the ones who are no longer children but not yet adults, our nation's adolescents.

As one who began teaching Sunday School when I was 12 years old and who spent many of my early years as a middle school and high school counselor, and as one who has worked with many organizations and groups such as Big Brothers, Big Sisters, youth clubs, youth organizations, and who has simply come into contact with young people, my home has always been sort of a haven for young people, and even as I was a kid growing up with ten brothers and sisters, my parents' home and our house was a haven for young people.

In many ways, I would certainly agree that the odds are often stacked against this age group.

Homicide is the second leading cause of death among young people ages 10 to 24 overall. Yet, many people in our society really don't have much wind of this. In this age group, it is the leading cause of death for African Americans and the second leading cause of death for Hispanics.

In 2001, 5,486 young people ages 10 to 24 were murdered, an average of 15 each day.

Suicide is the third leading cause of death among young people ages 15 to 24. In 2001, 3,971 suicides were reported in this group.

According to the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth, in 2003, the National Academy of Sciences estimates that one-quarter of the adolescents in this country are at serious risk of not achieving productive adulthood. Nationally, three of ten young people who enter public high school do not graduate 4 years later. The graduation rate is only 50 percent for Hispanic, African American, and Native American youth.

I want to thank my friend and colleague from Nebraska, Congressman Osborne, for introducing H.R. 856, the Federal Youth Coordination Act, and shedding additional light on the need for more discussion, more action, for the health and well being of our nation's young.

I have always been led to believe that the greatness of a society can be determined on how well it looks after its old, how well it looks after those who have difficulty caring for themselves, and how well it looks after and prepares its young for adulthood and continuing life.

I welcome this hearing and thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, for calling this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you.

We have two panels of witnesses today. I would like to remind all panelists that we have a 5-minute limit that we will go by today.

I will begin by introducing the distinguished witnesses on our first panel, Dr. Michael O'Grady, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and is the principal advisor to the Secretary on policy development and health disability, aging, human services, science and data.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary has played a coordinating function for many of the ongoing interdepartmental efforts addressing youth issues.

Currently, Dr. O'Grady serves as chairman of the Interagency Work Group on the Community Guide for Helping America's Youth.

Prior to his appointment, Dr. O'Grady served as the senior health economist on the majority staff of the Joint Economic Committees of the U.S. Congress. At the Committee, his work focused primarily on Medicare reform, the uninsured, and other national health issues.

Dr. O'Grady, thank you for being here. You may begin.

STATEMENT OF DR. MICHAEL J. O'GRADY, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PLANNING AND EVALUATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, WASHINGTON, DC

Dr. O'GRADY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to appear before you to discuss the important issue of coordinating our Federal efforts to improve the lives of youth.

The President showed his commitment to our nation's most vulnerable children and adolescents when he established the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth. He asked the Task Force to assess how Federal agencies might work more effectively to improve youth outcomes.

I'm here today to report on the administration's progress in implementing the Task Force's final recommendations. I will also discuss the President's and First Lady's most recent youth initiative, Helping America's Youth.

There is much good news to report on behalf of young Americans. Almost 72 million children in this country are doing well. They are being well prepared to take on the responsibilities of adulthood—self sufficiency, marriage and family, and civic engagement.

However, while many American children and youth are thriving in their families and communities, there are still far too many who are struggling and are at risk.

In December 2002, the President established the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth. The President appointed 11 different Federal agencies to the Task Force. He asked them to review all the existing Federal programs that served youth and then to make recommendations for improving agency effectiveness.

The Task Force concluded that the best way to get the greatest outcome for disadvantaged youth was to focus on four goals.

First, better management. Second, better accountability. Third, better parent/child connections, and fourth, giving priority to the neediest youth.

We are pleased to report that much has already been done to implement the Task Force recommendations. Progress has been made on all four goals.

Since today's discussion addresses coordination, I will focus my comments on our efforts to improve interagency coordination.

The report recommended that interagency coordination should be accomplished around topic areas or special target populations. This is the approach we have taken to date, and we think it is working well.

The needs of young people, particularly disadvantaged youth, are complex. A responsive Federal youth policy often requires the resources and expertise of multiple agencies. However, depending on the issue at hand, this may mean a different subset of agencies.

For example, when we are addressing the impact of television marketing on youth obesity, we involve the Department of Health and Human Services and the Federal Trade Commission, and possibly even the Federal Communications Commission. But this project is unlikely to have a meaningful role for an agency such as the Department of Justice.

In my written testimony, I describe how we are addressing the specific coordination identified in the report. For example, the Task Force identified the need to focus on youth aging out of foster care.

I am pleased to report that the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, Education and Justice have responded to this call by developing a national initiative to improve Federal, state and local services for these youth.

To provide ongoing support for departmental coordination, the Domestic Policy Council held periodic meetings to monitor the progress the agencies have made.

In addition, the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has selected 13 Task Force recommendations and made them the work of that council.

In my testimony, I have focused on where Federal agencies have been working together, but they have also been each working individually to implement recommendations in other areas, such as improving the quality and comprehensiveness of our Federal research on youth and youth programs.

The release of the Task Force report did not mark the end of our Federal efforts at coordination or the President's concern about helping disadvantaged youth.

Most recently, the President and Mrs. Bush launched the Helping America's Youth initiative. This initiative seeks to highlight effective community based programs in the three most important parts of children's and teens' lives, their families, their schools and their communities.

At a conference this Fall, the First Lady will unveil the Community Guide for Helping America's Youth. The guide, or tool, as it is known within the different departments, is being developed collaboratively by seven different departments.

It will provide information on youth development and community partnerships, as well as highlighting programs that have shown some promise of helping youth. It will help communities build partnerships, assess their needs and resources, and select the best programs to help their children and adolescents.

The development of the HAY tool has been a great example of how the agencies can be most productive when they collaborate around a well specified task.

In conclusion, I thank you for your interest in the coordination of youth programs. I know we share a vision of the goals we have for America's youth. I hope we can continue to work together to make this vision a reality.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Michael J. O'Grady follows:]

Statement of Dr. Michael J. O Grady, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, DC

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the important issue of coordinating our Federal efforts to improve the lives of youth, particularly those young people who need our help the most. The President showed his commitment to our nation's most vulnerable children and adolescents when he established the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth and asked the Task Force to assess how Federal agencies might work more effectively to improve youth outcomes. I'm here today to discuss the Administration's progress in implementing the Task Force's final recommendations. I will also briefly discuss the President and the First Lady's most recent youth initiative—Helping America's Youth (HAY). HAY is aimed at highlighting effective youth programs and providing information to communities on how they can come together to implement the best strategies for addressing the challenges their young people are facing.

There is much good news to report on behalf of young Americans. Most of the 72 million children in this country are doing well.¹ Within the context of their families and communities, they are being well-prepared to take on the responsibilities of adulthood—self-sufficiency, marriage and family, and civic engagement. More than two-thirds are living with two married parents. They feel connected to their parents and their schools, and these connections are helping them avoid behaviors that risk their current and future health and well-being. They are showing a commitment to their communities, with 27 percent of older teens volunteering to help in their neighborhoods or through service organizations.

However, while many American children and youth are thriving in their families and communities, there are still too many who are struggling and are at risk of not making the successful transition to adulthood. About 15 percent of American children live below the poverty level; these rates are almost twice as high for minority children.² Some have families who are unable to provide a nurturing home with the structure and support required for healthy development. More than half a million

¹Data sources for this section include: U.S. Census Bureau; "Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children and Youth, 2002". Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. This statistic refers to ages 0–17.

²30 percent of black children and 27 percent of Hispanic children live below the poverty level, 2001 data. \$17,650 for a family of four in 2001, per the U.S. Census Bureau.

children are living in foster care due to the inability of their families to provide a safe environment. About 1.5 million children had parents in State and Federal prisons. In 2003, just over 900,000 children were reported to have been abused or neglected. Each year, as many as one-and-a-half million children run away from home or find themselves on the streets and homeless.

Many of these difficult home and community environments contribute to adolescents engaging in risk taking behavior. Not living in a strong and nurturing family is probably one of the first predictors of poor outcomes. But even when families are functioning and capable, sometimes the problems they are attempting to address are simply beyond their capacity. The President believes every American has an opportunity to help children and youth in their families and communities to avoid trouble and lead more hopeful lives. Faith-based, community, and volunteer organizations across the Nation are involved in efforts to reach at-risk youth and get them involved in their communities. The President applauds their efforts while recognizing that the Federal government also plays an important role by pursuing policies that help the good works of these organizations.

In December of 2002, the President became concerned that the Federal agencies could be working more efficiently, individually and collectively, to develop and implement effective programs to help disadvantaged youth. This led him to establish the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth.

White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth

The President appointed 11 Federal agencies to the Task Force and asked them to review all the existing Federal programs that touched youth, and to make recommendations as to where there could be enhanced agency accountability and effectiveness.

Goals for Youth

The President believes in outcomes-based policy. During their first meetings, Task Force members were asked to consider the outcomes they hoped to achieve for at-risk youth. It was evident to the members that while they were focusing on the needs of a very specific population, what we want for disadvantaged youth is what we want for all our children. We hope that they will grow up to be:

- Healthy and Safe
- Ready for Work, College and Military Service
- Ready for Marriage, Family and Parenting
- Ready for Civic Engagement and Service

Because there were so many Federal programs to review, the Task Force divided itself into subcommittees focusing on each of these outcomes. An additional subcommittee addressed issues related to research and accountability.

Task Force staff then conducted a survey of all the Federal agencies to identify any program that touched youth. Through this survey, staff identified that in fiscal year 2002, there were 339 Federal programs that served or addressed issues relating to disadvantaged youth in some way. A total of 150 programs serve youth ages 0 to 21; 68 of those focus solely on school-age youth. The remaining 185 programs serve various ages of youth as well as adults; this can mean entire families, or adults who are working with youth. The programs were administered by 12 departments and agencies. Three departments, Health and Human Services, Justice, and Education, housed the bulk of the programs.

October 2003 Report Recommendations

Each subcommittee considered the programs that addressed their focal areas. Programs were reviewed to consider their alignment with the agencies' mission, their target populations, and the risky behaviors they hoped to avert. While they each looked at a different subset of programs, the committees ultimately came to similar conclusions: The best way to get the greatest outcomes for disadvantaged youth from the significant Federal funds invested was to focus on these four goals:

- better management,
- better accountability,
- better connections and
- priority to the neediest youth.

Progress on Recommendations

Since the completion of the report, we are pleased to report that much has been done to implement its recommendations. Progress has been made in all four areas, but since the bill being discussed today addresses coordination, I will focus my comments on our efforts to improve interagency coordination, particularly around prioritizing the needs of disadvantaged youth.

The report recommended that interagency coordination should be accomplished around topic areas or special target populations. This is the approach we have taken to date and that we think is working well. The needs of young people, particularly disadvantaged youth, are complex. Just as we acknowledge that a well functioning support system for youth requires input from families, schools and communities, a well-functioning Federal youth policy often requires the resources and expertise of multiple agencies. However depending on the issue at hand, this may mean a different subset of agencies. For example, when we are addressing the issue of impact of television marketing on childhood obesity, we would involve the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), maybe even the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), but there may be no meaningful role for the Department of Justice (DOJ).

Let me give you a few example of how we are coordinating within the Administration to improve outcomes for specific populations of youth.

Foster Care Youth and Workforce Preparation

The Task Force identified as a priority the needs of youth aging out of foster care. I am pleased to report that the Department of Labor (DOL), in partnership with the HHS, the Department of Education (ED) and DOJ, has responded to this call by developing a national initiative to improve Federal, State and local services for these youth. Their joint goals are to develop new and innovative service approaches, to enhance the quality of services delivered, and to improve program outcomes and efficiencies for youth who are commonly served across agency lines. Through a series of Regional Forums, these agencies convened 52 teams of program administrators from States and insular areas to identify opportunities for aligning services and creating ongoing strategies for improving programs across agency lines. Each team included representatives from the State workforce investment, education, juvenile justice and foster care agencies—many of whom had never before met together. This opportunity for discussion and interaction generated partnerships we hope these agencies will build over time.

Education and Out of School Youth

Another key area of focus is on providing more access to alternative education for out-of-school youth and outcome-based alternative education that is consistent with No Child Left Behind. The Department of Labor is developing a partnership with Department of Education to work on aligning efforts around alternative education, adolescent literacy and numeracy, and enhanced GED programs. Among other things, this partnership is exploring strategies for youth workforce development programs funded through the Workforce Investment Act (WIA), to support public school systems as they undertake the implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation.

Education of Migrant Youth

ED, HHS, USDA, and Labor have formed an interagency team to address the education needs of migrant youth. The team has developed a proposal for a demonstration project that would allow for enrollment of migrant out-of-school youth in education programs at various locations along the migrant stream. This proposal is being finalized and soon the departments will publish a concept paper that details the demonstration in the Federal Register for public review and comment.

Youth Offenders and Workforce Preparation

DOL has recently announced several other reforms that aim to more effectively and efficiently serve out-of-school and at-risk youth through the workforce investment system by focusing on four major areas. The strategic vision underlying these initiatives specifically targeted to youth offenders was developed in partnership with ED, HHS and DOJ. Examples include: helping youth offenders improve reading and math skills, building partnerships between the public workforce system, business and industry representatives, the juvenile justice system, and education and training providers, including faith-based and community organizations.

Trafficking

The Administration has become very concerned about the issue of human trafficking. We are seeing a strong coordinated effort between HHS, DOJ and, now, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) on juvenile trafficking in particular. While HHS provides humanitarian assistance to trafficking victims, DOJ prosecutes traffickers, and DHS (and the FBI) are usually the lead investigative agency uncovering and developing trafficking cases. The structure of the effort is such that whoever “first” uncovers trafficking cases coordinates with the other agencies to ensure that

the statute's requirements related to both law enforcement and humanitarian assistance are followed.

Coordination Around Specific Topics

But our coordination efforts are not limited to the needs of specific youth populations. There are issues that affect the entire youth population and require the attention of multiple agencies. For example:

The Impact of Marketing on Childhood Obesity:

HHS is working with the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) to examine issues around marketing of food and beverages to children in light of child health concerns, including the rise in childhood obesity. HHS and the FTC will jointly sponsor a workshop to examine various perspectives on marketing, self-regulation, and childhood obesity. The workshop will bring together representatives from food and beverage companies, media and entertainment companies, medical and nutrition experts, consumer groups, advertising specialists, and other key experts for an open discussion on industry self-regulation concerning the marketing of food and beverages to children, as well as initiatives to educate children and parents about nutrition.

These are just some examples of the way we are coordinating our Federal efforts to help youth. I have focused on where the Federal agencies have been working together, but they have also each been working individually to implement activities responding to all four of the areas in which the Task Force issued recommendations. In particular, there have been great efforts to improve the quality and comprehensiveness of our Federal research on youth and youth programs. The President is committed to our better understanding and supporting what works for youth and not supporting programs that have been shown to be ineffective.

Monitoring the Federal Youth Efforts

The Domestic Policy Council has periodically held meetings to monitor the progress the agencies have made on the Report recommendation. In addition, the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention has selected thirteen of the Task Force recommendations and made them the work of the Council. The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 established the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (Council) as an independent body within the Executive branch of the Federal Government. The Council's primary function is to provide interdepartmental coordination of Federal juvenile delinquency prevention programs, Federal programs and activities that detain or care for unaccompanied juveniles, and Federal programs relating to missing and exploited children.

Helping America's Youth

The release of the Task Force report did not mark the end of our Federal efforts at coordination or the President's concern about helping disadvantaged youth. Most recently, the President and Mrs. Bush launched the Helping America's Youth Initiative. This initiative seeks to highlight effective community based programs in the three most important parts of children's and teens' lives: their families, schools and communities.

The First Lady has been touring the country visiting community, school and faith-based programs and will culminate her tour with a conference in the Fall, in which researchers, program and community leaders will highlight what works to help improve youth outcomes. At this conference she will unveil the Community Guide to Helping America's Youth. The guide (or the tool, as we have come to call it) is being developed collaboratively by seven Departments. It will provide information on youth development and community partnerships, as well as highlighting programs that have shown research-based evidence that are helping youth. It will help communities build partnerships, assess their needs and resources and select the best programs to help their children and adolescents. The development of the HAY tool has been a great example of how the agencies can be most productive when they collaborate around a well-specified objective.

Conclusion

I thank you for your interest in the coordination of youth programs. I know we share a vision of the goals we have for American youth. I hope we can continue to work together to make this vision a reality.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you, Dr. O'Grady, for coming today on short notice. Appreciate your testimony and your efforts in this area.

I am going to yield my 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, Congressman Osborne.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Dr. O'Grady, for your testimony.

A couple of questions. Do the departments have the authority they need under statute to do as much coordinating as needed?

We realize there are some cases where actually statute prohibits one agency from interfacing effectively with another agency.

Do you feel there are no barriers here, or do you see some barriers that need to be removed?

Dr. O'GRADY. When you mentioned that in your opening statement, I was a little surprised at that, and I would like to follow up with you, if you can identify where those are.

The various ones I've been involved with, I haven't seen that. I am not saying it is not there. I would like to identify where it is and see if we can't fix it.

At this point, what we are finding is that the ability to coordinate is working well and it is working better than it has in the past. These different agencies share a common goal in fixing things. We have not had some of our own internal concerns, like turf, competition, or anything like that, or you pay for it, not me. We are seeing that kind of coordination and it seems to be working well.

For the most part, this is—my background is in research. This is a situation where people find other people are working on the same sort of topics that they are. For the most part, it is a very positive experience to sit down with other people wrestling with the exact same problems and seeing if you can't combine resources and thoughts and come up with something better.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you. Assuming that things are going very well, what about assurances of the Federal Government to continue this level of intensity and coordination efforts at the end of the current President's term in office?

Is there anything that we have ongoing now that ensures that there will be continued cooperation?

Dr. O'GRADY. Certainly we have the leadership of the Domestic Policy Council. Whether they are transferring into another Administration is certainly anybody's guess. There is no doubt about that.

What we have done is by breaking down some of the previous barriers, and some of them weren't even barriers, they were just the team at this department did not know the people on the team at the other department, once you built up that sort of a working relationship across these lines, that is a working relationship that we know certainly our senior civil servants and our civil servants will continue on from one Administration to the next.

If you plant that seed and you get that sort of working relationship and you establish it well and you have some success under your belt, the likelihood of that continuing certainly is excellent.

Mr. OSBORNE. I can see that point, that certainly once you get some communication going, it may continue. We have no certainty

that it will. That is why we are somewhat concerned about at least some statutory obligation to do so.

Let me give you a personal example. We had an amendment in No Child Left Behind to establish mentoring programs. We specified that one of the reasons we were doing this was to No. 1, increase the number of young people in mentoring relationships, but also to examine the different types of mentoring programs, what works, what doesn't work, what is going on in this part of the country that is not happening somewhere else.

And now about 3 years later, we have asked where is the assessment. How do we know that this is working.

We got sort of a review of the literature. We have been told now that they are going to hire a consulting firm to get this information.

This is the original intent of the amendment. What I am getting at is that we feel very strongly that despite your efforts, and I am sure they are very good, and I am sure progress has been made, we would like to see a little bit more follow through in these types of areas where we are holding people to a greater degree of accountability.

I don't know if you have a comment on that or not.

Dr. O'GRADY. On that one in particular, I don't know. Back to your earlier comment, we do know that the Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council is in statute and will continue on from one Administration to the next.

The other thing in terms of thinking about how you sort of build a legacy and how you continue to develop these working relationships, some of the things that have gone on, what I would call the management in the executive branch, has facilitated this. It's much easier than it was years ago.

The ability for agencies to pool and partner with each other, to share funding, to put it together to be able to build that critical mass as an investment and the need to move forward is much easier.

On the idea of coming in with assessments in terms of coming up with—I had the shop at Planning and Evaluation at HHS. The world is full of good intentions. What we really need is to be careful with the taxpayers' dollars and to know what works and what doesn't. What is best practice.

I agree with you totally on that. I would say also from everything we have seen from the Office of Management and Budget over the last few years, they want to know about return on investment. They want just those sort of measures you were talking about.

As this program works, what are the parts that are working well, what are the parts that need fixed, you need to take another look at because they just don't seem to be producing results.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you, Dr. O'Grady. Mr. Chairman, I yield back. I see that my time limit has expired.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Congressman Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have always had a great deal of respect for planning and evaluation in the Human Services and the provision of programs. I thank you very much again, Dr. O'Grady, for being here.

I agree that the problems are of great magnitude across the country. Of course, I come from an inner city area of one of the largest cities in the country. I come from Chicago, where the problems are enormous, just in terms of the sheer numbers, the magnitude, the difficulty of living in a big urban environment, all of the competing forces and competing activities.

I am very interested in youth offenders in the work place. As a matter of fact, just this past Saturday, we had one meeting where we had more than 3,000 offenders come, some young, some older, trying to fit them with cleaning up their records so they could have access to employment opportunities.

Could you tell us when your report is going to be available, and could you go a bit more into detail than what we have been able to glean from your testimony?

Dr. O'GRADY. I think there are a number of different things, if you don't mind, that I could talk about. Youth offenders in the work place and that notion, that certainly is an area that we are looking at, that we are doing the research on now to try and figure out exactly what can be the most help.

We already have Welfare to Work. Folks coming out of prison, coming out of incarceration, what about their families while they are in. What about getting them back in the labor force.

At this point, there are a number of different pieces that we have sponsored at the University of Michigan that are looking at some of these issues. I think it is sort of the next frontier after Welfare to Work, how to re-integrate folks back into the community after that sort of a problem.

In terms of some of the other things we talked about, one of the things that we are trying to do more and more, what we are talking specifically about today is across Federal agencies, but one of the things we have had a lot of success with is the idea of as we start thinking about how the Feds coordinate with the state, coordinate with local, county and municipal government, and how you can do that in a more intelligent way, along the lines of what was talked about before, where you can identify best practice.

That is a number of things where we found with the strategic investment of Federal taxpayers' dollars, you can bring those people together, you can show them what is going on, you can do presentations, and we have a number of things having to do with homelessness and other problems, and we have had very good success bringing those different teams from different states and different municipalities together.

One of the real strengths we have with our country—because some of the other work I do, I do some of the international work at the OECD in Paris, and one of the things is we really have an advantage here.

If you have a system where the Government runs the entire health care system or the entire welfare system, my counterparts in Cleveland or France, they have a heck of a time figuring out what are their alternatives, what works. I think that is a real advantage of not only this coordination among the Feds, but also going to the state and the locals, so you have that sort of natural laboratory.

We tried this in Indianapolis, this worked, this didn't. We tried this in Cleveland, this worked, this didn't. You can sort of learn from other people, and also learn what not to do.

In terms of making those sorts of efforts and figuring out how to do this smarter, I think there are a number of different points. Certainly, how you bring folks back into the community is one of the most important ones I can think of.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me also suggest—I agree we can get a great deal out of coordination, because you can connect things and see who is doing what and really know what is happening.

Of course, many of the people that I interact with in child welfare and human services complain that they just don't have any resources to work with, or they don't have adequate resources.

I know this legislation does not talk about authorization of money, but is the administration talking about how to get resources into the activity so that the ideas can in fact be better implemented?

Dr. O'GRADY. Yes. I think in terms of when you think about the Federal Government, the role they play—it is true, people appear from all the data we look at that they are eligible for different programs, and some of that is out reach. You see people who every indication says they are eligible for Medicaid. How do you get them in.

Some of that when you think about our mainstream program, our big one, Medicare, and some of the other big programs we have, where you know you can provide a lot of resources to folks, for instance, the children's health insurance program, those sorts of things. You know you can do better.

The other things that the Federal Government does and it is always welcome but they always wish there was more, is the idea of the Feds moving in—it's almost venture capital. Give a grant to a community, see if it will work, but it almost always mean there is a 5-year phaseout or something like that.

The Federal Government is more than happy to come in and kind of take the risk, but then when the program is up and running, normally that money is phasing out and then it is either at state or local.

At that point, that is the time, I think, to come back to Congress and say this seemed to work, this didn't, this state is really happy with the way this is going.

The traditional Federal role, other than our big programs, tends more to be sort of we are willing to finance the experiment, but if it's ready to go to scale, then we are certainly looking to start other partners.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Congresswoman McMorris.

Ms. MCMORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I also, Dr. O'Grady, want to just applaud the goals that you laid out as far as the management, accountability, and strengthening the family and then targeting the at risk.

I guess I think one of the biggest challenges with all of these programs is actually getting the money on the ground to where services are delivered.

I wanted to start out by just asking you if you could give me a sense from what you know as to how much money actually stays within the administration, within the management level, as compared to the money that actually gets on the ground and put into services.

Dr. O'GRADY. I don't have a specific figure and I don't want to shoot from the hip, so if you don't mind, I'll have my staff get back to you with a more detailed answer to that.

I would say there are sort of two parts on that. Some of the stuff we see in programs like Medicare, there is certainly an argument that is being made that if you are going to do something like a prescription drug benefit, you better have an administrative infrastructure there that is fairly developed to make sure seniors know what their options are and things like that.

I think we are always trying to keep the size of bureaucracy down, the size of Government down. At the same time, we don't want to short shrift the responsibilities.

Ms. MCMORRIS. One of our continual challenges is dealing with coordination between the agencies. You spoke about the disadvantaged youth programs and how they are within Health and Human Services. They are within Justice, within Education.

Can you give me a sense as to what mechanisms are really in place to ensure coordination, or if you think it is necessary that we set up some kind of new mechanism to evaluate?

Dr. O'GRADY. I think right now, the working relationship that we are having, which is coordinated through the Domestic Policy Council, coordinated through the White House, is the one that we are finding is working for us.

When you bring together these different people from the different agencies, not only is it working fairly collaboratively, but you can see the improved product.

Later this week, we are doing a joint session with the Federal Trade Commission having to do with youth obesity and advertising to youth, and kind of what those interactions are.

That has worked very well from our side. The Federal Trade Commission, they know tons about advertising. They know tons about the airways and truth in advertising, those sorts of questions.

Health and childhood obesity was not their strong point. We brought that to the table. They brought their expertise to the table. The combined effect was certainly very effective.

At the same time, I guess I would put on the table the idea that you want to remain as flexible as you can. In my testimony, I talk a little bit about you want the right players at the table, but it's not always necessary to have every player at the table, and it can be sometimes counter productive.

In a case like this, that is where no, we didn't coordinate tons with our colleagues at Justice or we touched base with some people, but there are other people. You want the people who are really going to contribute and really have the expertise at the table.

Ms. MCMORRIS. Kind of in that same vein, how do you go about actually coordinating with the state and local at that level to ensure that money is targeted in such a way that is really going to have the most impact in a local community?

Dr. O'GRADY. The way that we tend to do that, and I would say outside the big entitlement programs and some of the other things going on, is we do have the ability to fairly effectively and fairly flexibly co-fund different projects like this.

In the old days, it certainly wasn't true, but our ability to say that we want to put something together, like I say, we are putting on this effort with the FTC, the idea of HHS can move their money over to the FTC, FTC can move their money over, so you have one source that is handling this.

It is an ability to coordinate not only with the staff and have them talking and make sure that works right, but also to do just what you are talking about, can you pool your resources so there is a coordinated one effort that is sort of moving out and making sure this thing happens.

Ms. MCMORRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Congressman Inglis.

Mr. INGLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me back up, if I may, from the questions on coordination and those kinds of things to a more general question.

What can the Federal Government do to replace parents? How effective is this? What can we really do?

Here is what I am wondering about. I was with a group of folks on Saturday night who identified that many of the problems with troubled youth is they lack a parent.

Sitting there in that group, I didn't want to have a response of let them eat cake, let them go find better parents.

The question is how do you make better parents. An example was brought up of a 35 year old grandmother who has no parenting skills and who passed onto her child no parenting skills, and who is now passing onto her child no parenting skills.

Here we are, trying to figure out, I guess, as a government, how to fix that 35 year old grandmother's problem, and her daughter and her daughter's child.

Backing up a little bit, just tell me, what can we do?

Dr. O'GRADY. To your first question, are we ever going to replace parents, certainly not. That's not the role of Government.

It is the role of Government to be able to do what it can. Is it a proper policy goal to be as supportive of parents as possible? Sure. That is the kind of stuff we can do. That is the sort of thing we can do to try and help keep families together.

There are different programs. You laid out a very thorny problem of what you can do. I am trying to think of the name of the program, and I am blank.

There are programs that do things like when that person comes in, this is a pregnant woman, it is clear this is an average situation, the baby is going to be born. You can send that visiting nurse in and you can show how to childproof the house. You can never twist anybody's arm. If they throw you out, they throw you out.

The Government can support parenting, not try to replace it, but they can support. That program goes in before the baby is born, it sort of shows how to get ready. It shows all these different things, feeding.

It is not the Feds or the states or whatever doing it for them, but it is simply providing them—along the lines of the kind of men-

toring that Congressman Osborne was talking about. If there are no skills in the traditional way, we learn from our parents, we learn from our teachers, are there things you can do.

I think it is along those models. We know certainly traditionally the major influences on most of us in our lives are our parents. We know there are those special teachers, that Scout leader, that coach, other people.

You can try to build that sort of support network.

The point about coming out of prison, that is a very tenuous situation. If you can keep that family together, if you can get somebody back in the labor force, get them back on track.

Mr. INGLIS. A good example you just used about childproofing the home. We, the Government, send somebody in to help childproof the home. We have the home childproofed. Now, we have to talk about how to teach reading, and then we need to talk about eating properly. Then we need to talk about—in other words, through this 35 year old grandmother's home, we may run a whole series of people.

If all the programs are working optimally, I suppose we would have about ten people knocking on her door and working with her.

You begin to wonder how do you replace this thing called a parent, her parent, the 35 year old grandmother's parent. The parent is this multi-faceted person who does some things well and some things poorly. I've surely done some things poorly as a parent, a few things well.

You start trying to replace them, and you literally have 10 to 12 people knocking on the door.

I am wondering is the model working. Is there some other way to have a single—I don't know what the single mentor would be, but somebody to really love and care for this 35 year old grandmother, and to help that whole family, but it takes somebody very committed to them, and somebody that 35 year old grandmother can grow to trust, but the 10 to 12 people knocking on the door, helping childproof first and then food next. The woman is going to get worn out by the people coming to the door.

Dr. O'GRADY. You are absolutely right. We try to get that down to kind of one shot shopping, that there is somebody that comes in.

In this particular area—we have some things like with folks with disabilities, where really what they need is somebody who can help them with housing questions, with medical questions, food, different things.

You have to a certain degree an expertise developing there in terms of whatever you want to think about, coping skills. You try to not have this parade of folks going through. You have somebody who specializes and says, you know, an extra set of rails on your steps, how to move them up the learning curve.

You are never going to twist their arm. You are never going to say the Government will come in and replace unless you have child welfare. If a child is at risk, that is different.

How do you take folks and help bring them along, and just show them what other people have learned works over time.

You are absolutely right, try to keep that to a minimum. Some of it, you may not be able to. It may take a few different people.

You do not want to be running 10 or 12 people through anybody's house.

Mr. INGLIS. My time is almost up. It seems to me that what is clear is you have to find support systems within communities that really can plug into love and care for that 35 year old grandmother in a consistent sustained way, and help care for that whole family.

Certainly, the Government has a role. It is pretty clear to me that churches and synagogues have a tremendous additional role in a caring community that can somehow come along side that 35 year old grandmother.

It is a real challenge. I do not feel I have very satisfactory answers. I don't know that any of us really do. That is very frustrating.

I appreciate the comments.

Chairman TIBERI. Dr. O'Grady, thank you for your time. One additional question by the Ranking Member.

Mr. DAVIS. Dr. O'Grady, do programs grow out of Planning and Evaluation activity in terms of planning, and looking at what has not worked or trying to determine how to get to the end result?

The question was sort of stimulated by my colleague's focus on parenting. It seems to me that one of the great needs that exists in many communities for troubled youth is to have parenting activities to help their parents better learn and understand how to become parents.

I had a great experience visiting with my father who just died last year but he was 92 years old, so he had a great run. A few years before that, he was living in the State of Arkansas and I went to visit with him.

We went to the supermarket. A group of young women sort of converged around him. They were hugging him and kissing him and all those kinds of things. I jokingly said to him, what is happening, what's going on? All these young ladies.

He said, what are you talking about. Finally, he said you know, they are doing that because I'm a foster grandparent. I help teach them how to raise their children, how to understand things that perhaps they were not taught.

Is that an area that maybe we can seriously develop more program activity in? Parenting classes and opportunities for young parents who really haven't learned how to be parents.

Dr. O'GRADY. There are a number of things that are being done, but is there always something, is there always more innovation and a more creative way to think about putting these things together? Of course.

That is the sort of stuff that we do at Planning and Evaluation. What works. What doesn't. What have you learned from what other people have tried and what are gaps that you really do want to move into, because there is just not, for whatever reason, nobody has done it yet, and it looks like there is a crying need for it.

In terms of that sort of area, thinking about parenting, we can see things like—one of the most effective anti-poverty tools we have is an intact family. It can do more than lots of other things we have tried in different ways.

How do you keep people—just support that. Not tell people how to run their lives, but certainly help them out if they need help, and show them what other people have learned.

Mr. DAVIS. I want to see us put some money into it. I think we could not necessarily have to put a lot of money into it, because you are dealing with groups of people, teaching them how to do things themselves. I believe if they knew better, as my mother used to tell us, they would do better.

I thank you for your testimony and appreciate the indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Congressman Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being late, Mr. Secretary.

I don't know what has been covered or what actually has not been covered, but I do want to maybe make a comment and ask your opinion.

One of the things just growing up, you see kids and students in certain school districts who have a lot more opportunities, I think, at a very young age, to kind of grab onto something that interests them. Many times, it is sports, but other times it is speech, drama, arts, visual arts, music, something.

I just think it is very important for young kids to have that outlet, something that they love, that they are willing to not be good at at first and then master and develop some kind of self confidence.

I just think the arts is a great opportunity for a lot of young students. I think it is a shame that those of us who have been fortunate in life have those opportunities and a lot of other students do not.

Just comment for me on how important you think that is or if it is not important or if I am in la la land somewhere.

Dr. O'GRADY. I'm with Health and Human Services, my traditional jurisdiction. When we think about these situations of how you help disadvantaged youth, how you move forward, I sort of take all the tools in the tool box approach to what you need.

How do you reach somebody? How do you find their passion or whatever you want to think about it. I tend to think of art in there with sports and with other things that schools can offer, other things they can take, Scouting, all these different things.

Especially if you have somebody who maybe doesn't have the best home life or had some other bump in the road that they are facing, is there something that will just motivate them just the way you talked about.

I guess I think of that within this whole sort of tool box of things you would like to be able to have sort of catch their interest and help them to be able, like you said, to focus on something, develop a real motivation and really develop in that area, and then feel good about themselves.

Mr. RYAN. The reason I brought this up to you is I have read articles lately talking about music therapy. Is this an area worth pursuing or something you are familiar with?

Dr. O'GRADY. I don't know enough about music therapy to comment.

Mr. RYAN. I don't either. That is why I asked you. I appreciate it.

Dr. O'GRADY. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Thank you, Dr. O'Grady, for your testimony and your time today. Thank you for being here. I am sure the sponsor of the bill and other Members of the Committee are going to look forward to working with you as we continue to struggle with this issue and improve upon it.

Dr. O'GRADY. Thank you very much for having me.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. I am going to ask the second panel to come forward. While we are doing that, I am going to introduce our four panelists as we are setting up.

The reason for that is we are being told we are going to have a vote between 11:45 and 12. I would like to get all four panelists' testimony in before our next series of votes.

Let me introduce Richard Moore. Mr. Moore serves as Administrator of the Iowa Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Statistical Center at the Iowa Department of Human Rights in Des Moines, Iowa.

He has designed and developed original policies and the service delivery structure for Iowa's family centered and family preservation service programs, as well as policies to enable the de-categorization of child welfare and juvenile justice funds.

Mr. Moore is a convener of the Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development, an interagency initiative designed to better align state level youth policies and programs and to encourage collaboration among multiple state and community agencies on youth related issues.

I would like to welcome Ms. Laura Shubilla. Ms. Shubilla is a co-founder of the Philadelphia Youth Network, a non-profit organization dedicated to the goal of ensuring that all of Philadelphia's youth have the tools and opportunities they need to succeed in the workforce and the world.

Philadelphia Youth Network reaches thousands of 14 to 21 year old youth each year, most of whom live in poverty and would otherwise have few opportunities to envision their own career potential and a pathway to achieving it.

Ms. Shubilla served as the Philadelphia Youth Network senior vice president from its inception in 1999 and was appointed as president of the organization in July of 2002.

I would like to introduce Ms. Marguerite Sallee. Ms. Sallee is the president and CEO of America's Promise, The Alliance for Youth, founded after the President's Summit for America's Future in 1997 with Presidents Bush, Carter and Clinton, and Ford, with Nancy Reagan representing President Reagan, challenging the country to make children and youth a national priority.

Prior to joining the America's Promise, she served as special assistant to U.S. Senator Lamar Alexander, and was staff director for the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Families.

Her focus in this Congress has been on education, health care, social welfare, and the challenges of working families, especially military families.

And last but not least, Dr. Laurence Steinberg, who is the distinguished university professor of psychology at Temple University, a nationally recognized expert on psychological development during adolescence.

Dr. Steinberg's research has focused on a range of topics in the study of contemporary adolescence, including parent/adolescent relationships, adolescent employment, high school reform and juvenile justice.

He is a fellow of the American Psychological Association and has been a faculty scholar of the William T. Grant Foundation, and is currently director of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice.

Thank you all for being here. Before the witnesses begin, I would like to remind you that we will have an opportunity to ask you questions after the panel is through with their testimony, and remind you of Committee Rule 2, which imposes a 5-minute limit on your testimony.

Your testimony will be submitted fully for the record.

With that, Mr. Moore.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD G. MOORE, CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE PLANNING DIVISION, IOWA DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS, DES MOINES, IA

Mr. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak here today.

I am here representing the State of Iowa. I am also here representing the Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development.

I have worked in my state's government for over 26 years. Since 1988, I have been the administrator of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. I have been appointed to this office by both Democratic and Republican Governors, confirmed by Iowa Senate, controlled by both parties, and I am just starting my fifth 4 year term.

I have been actively involved in the planning and monitoring of youth policies and programs centered in Iowa's juvenile justice, child welfare, substance abuse, mental health, workforce development, economic development, volunteer services, vocational rehabilitation, public health, public safety and other state systems.

I have had to respond to many different political environments and many, many Federal officials, regulations, mandates, special conditions and reporting requirements.

Before I go any further, I do want to applaud your efforts to consider the Federal Youth Coordination Act. Its provisions are quite simply very good ideas.

First, I want to make four points. First, there is a growing interest in states to do a better job of improving the coordination of child and youth policies and programs. The impetus of the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth and its concerns over the complexity of Federal responses to disadvantaged youth are gaining support from outside the Federal Government.

Support for coordinating Government efforts for children, youth and families is growing in the National Conference of State Legis-

lators, the National Governors Association, and a number of foundations and national organizations.

A number of states currently have children's cabinets and other states are working on other such coordinating structures, such as Iowa's.

Iowa's Collaboration for Youth Development is a partnership of state and local interests. Our community partners regularly remind us that they know better coordination is needed at their level to maximize resources and that they are willing partners for efforts designed to build bridges between the many separate programs and systems that they are expected to make sense out of.

There is interest, and I believe energies not yet fully tapped across states to take bigger steps toward achieving more coordinated networks of youth programs.

One thing lacking seems to be a clear national vision that includes recognition of how fragmented Federal initiatives can hinder emerging and promising state and local coordination efforts.

The Federal Youth Coordination Act, if passed, could invigorate current efforts and leverage additional investments to improve coordination across the board.

My second point is collaboration on children and youth issues has made an important difference in Iowa. Our collaboration is designed to better align state level policies and programs and to encourage collaboration among multiple state and community agencies.

Initiated in 1999 with funding from the Department of Health and Human Services' Family and Youth Services Bureau, FYSB, our state agencies have been partnering with communities and youth throughout the state, and we have accomplished a number of things.

We have established a multi-agency state level governance structure that supports both individual agencies as well as interagency youth initiatives.

We have agreed upon a common youth results framework that multiple state agencies are now using in their administration of both Federal and state programs.

We have established a set of data indicators and providing data reports to local communities for their use in planning and evaluating their services across systems.

We have consolidated the planning and application requirements for some of our Federal and state programs, so communities are developing one rather than two or three plans.

We have done many other things to increase coordination, a few more which I have listed in my written statement, but there is more that we know we can do.

My third point is that support from the Federal Government has been instrumental in advancing youth program coordination efforts in Iowa. Our collaboration work would not have been possible without the assistance of FYSB and funding from their Positive Youth Development State and Local Demonstration Project.

Sometimes despite how good an idea might be, it takes leadership or recognition from the outside for others to join with you. Being able to highlight the Federal Government's support of our

goals and activities has clearly been an important aspect of getting people together to work together.

We have also benefited from the technical support and knowledge of FYSB and its partners. They have given us exposure and a chance to meet with experts from across the country and to network with other states trying to do similar things as we are.

FYSB's modest investment in our work has led to results noticed by others outside of Iowa. We have received financial and other supports from the National Crime Prevention Council, the Mott Foundation, the National Governors Association, America's Promise, the Form for Youth Investment, and others.

Similarly, using our collaborative entity, we have been successful in applying for Federal grants from other than FYSB to add to our collaboration's reach and impact.

Probably the most compelling reason for me to travel from the Midwest to speak to you today was my belief that the Federal Youth Coordination Act's provisions to assist the states in a manner similar to what FYSB has been trying to do will help Iowa sustain its efforts.

My fourth and final point is the Federal Youth Coordination Act would have a major impact in Iowa, as well as the Nation as a whole.

It is only in communities that true service coordination at the case level can really occur, but local abilities to achieve such coordination is limited by state and Federal categorical programs that have different sounding goals and that dictate separate eligibility criteria, duplicative or disparate program or case planning activities, different reporting requirements, and so on and so on.

Community level coordination should be a natural outgrowth of coordination at the state and Federal levels. Similarly, state level efforts to assist local coordination needs Federal leadership to coordinate policies and program requirements from the different Federal agencies.

I am supposed to sum up and be done. Thank you for your time and all your efforts.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Richard G. Moore follows:]

Statement of Richard G. Moore, Criminal and Juvenile Justice, Planning Division, Iowa Department of Human Rights, Des Moines, IA

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you on this important topic.

I am here today representing the State of Iowa. I am also here to represent the Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development of which I am the convener and a founding member.

I have worked in my state's government for over twenty-six years. Since 1988, I have been the Administrator of the Iowa Department of Human Rights Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning. I was initially appointed and twice re-appointed to my office by Governor Terry E. Branstad. In 1999, my third appointment was continued by Governor Thomas J. Vilsack who has since chosen to re-appoint me for an additional two four-year terms. My appointments have been confirmed by Iowa Senates controlled by both parties.

I have watched or helped the creation, evolution, and sometimes the ending of a multitude of state and federal policies and programs affecting youth. I have been responsible for the administration of a variety of state and federal child welfare and juvenile justice programs in Iowa, and I have been actively involved in the planning or monitoring of youth policies and programs centered in Iowa's education, human services, substance abuse, mental health, workforce development, economic development, volunteer services, vocational rehabilitation, public safety and other state sys-

tems. I have had to respond to many different political environments and many, many federal officials, regulations, mandates, special conditions and reporting requirements affecting programs for youth. Before I go any further I want to applaud your efforts to consider the Federal Youth Coordination Act. Its provisions are, quite simply, very good ideas.

In my testimony, I hope to make the following additional points:

1. There is a growing interest in states to do a better job of improving the coordination of child and youth policies and programs.
2. Collaboration on children and youth issues is making an important difference in Iowa.
3. Support from the Federal government has been instrumental in advancing efforts in Iowa.
4. The Federal Youth Coordination Act would have a major impact in Iowa as well as the nation as a whole.

There is a growing interest in states to do a better job of improving the coordination of child and youth policies and programs.

The White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth found that “the complexity of the problems faced by disadvantaged youth is matched only by the complexity of the traditional Federal response to those problems. Both are confusing, complicated, and costly.” Similar situations exist at the state level, but we know that better coordination can make local responses to the problems of disadvantaged youth less confusing, less complicated, and more cost-effective.

The impetus of the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth has already gained support from outside the federal government. Support for coordinating government efforts for children, youth and families is growing in the National Conference of State Legislators, the National Governors Association, private foundations and organizations, and states and communities across the country.

The National Governors Association recently released a report entitled “A Governor’s Guide to Children’s Cabinets”. This report found that “At least 16 states have a Children’s Cabinet, and all indications suggest that many others are likely to follow.” A number of states are attempting to support similar coordination structures under different names, such as councils, commissions or task forces. Our Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development is one example.

The National Conference of State Legislators and the National Governor’s Association are currently working together on a youth policy initiative to highlight ways state executive and legislative branches can work together to promote better coordinated child and youth policies.

Foundations such as Atlantic, Robert Wood Johnson, Kellogg and Mott have moved in parallel fashion by investing in collaborative youth-oriented efforts. Organizations such as America’s Promise, the Forum for Youth Investment, the National Collaboration for Youth and others have geared up to provide technical assistance, networking, and visibility to many state and local collaborative efforts.

Iowa’s Collaboration for Youth Development is a partnership of state and local interests. The community leaders and agencies with which we interact regularly remind us that they know better coordination is needed at their level to maximize resources, that they are willing to try new ways of providing state and federally funded services, that they want to improve their results and become more cost effective and that they are willing partners for efforts designed to build bridges between the many fragmented programs and systems that are in place to help youth and families succeed.

There is interest—and energies not yet fully tapped—across states and in many private organizations as well as in most communities to take bigger steps toward achieving more coordinated networks of effective youth programs. One thing lacking is a clear national vision that includes recognition of how fragmented federal initiatives will hinder emerging and promising state and local coordination efforts. What does seem clear at this time is that the Federal Youth Coordination Act, if passed, could invigorate current efforts and leverage additional investments to deepen and advance collaborative efforts across the board.

Collaboration on children and youth issues has made an important difference in Iowa.

The Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development is an interagency initiative designed to better align state-level youth policies and programs and to encourage collaboration among multiple state and community agencies on youth-related issues. Our overarching, multi-system goals are to increase the extent to which Iowa youth have opportunities to be involved, to engage in behaviors that are healthy and socially competent, to achieve success in school and to be prepared for a career and

a productive adulthood. Initiated in 1999 with funding from the Department of Health and Human Services' Family and Youth Services Bureau, we have been partnering with communities and youth throughout the state and have achieved a variety of results.

We have established a multi-agency state-level governance structure that supports both individual agencies' initiatives and interagency initiatives related to youth development.

We agreed upon a common youth results framework that multiple state agencies are now using in their planning and monitoring of otherwise separate federal and state youth-at-risk programs.

We have established a set of data indicators, combined resources to conduct a statewide survey of youth to establish inter-disciplinary measures of youth, school, neighborhood and community risk and protective factors, and we have provided local areas with data reports designed to assist program planning, coordination and evaluation across service systems.

We have consolidated the planning requirements for some of our state and federal programs so local applicants are developing one, rather than two or three plans.

We have established ongoing and regular contacts among staff from multiple state agencies and other organizations to proactively identify and then carry out collaborative activities, and we have provided teams of these state agencies' staff to work with communities as they plan and coordinate their use of funding from a variety of local, state and federal sources.

We are supporting a youth development collaboration website and newsletter, and we sponsor policy forums and other activities that provide information to encourage collaborations across systems and to assist efforts that promote and achieve positive youth development.

We also have combined resources from multiple agencies to provide across-systems youth worker and youth leadership training and to assist officials and local agencies actively involve youth in planning and other civic activities.

There is much more that we know can be done to better align the many youth-oriented policies and programs created or administered by the state. Some of the entrenched challenges still face us, and new challenges continue to surface.

Support from the federal government has been instrumental in advancing youth program coordination efforts in Iowa.

Our work through the Iowa Collaboration for Youth Development would not have been possible without the help we received from the federal Department of Health and Human Services' Family and Youth Services Bureau. Iowa is one of a handful of states that was chosen to participate in FYSB's Positive Youth Development State and Local Demonstration Project. The number of Iowa agencies and organizations that have agreed to work together and with FYSB continues to grow, and we are developing visible links with more and more communities across the state.

Sometimes, despite how good an idea might be, it takes leadership or recognition from the outside to get others to join with you. Being able to highlight the federal government's (FYSB's) support of our collaboration's goals and activities has clearly been an important aspect of our sustenance and progress to date.

In addition to the funding, we also have benefited from the technical support and knowledge of FYSB and its partners. Their support has provided us with opportunities to share problems, ideas and plans with experts from across the country and has helped us exchange ideas and develop networking relationships with other states attempting efforts similar to ours.

FYSB's modest investment of its federal funding in our work has led to results noticed by others outside of Iowa. Our collaborative work has been fortunate to receive financial and other supports from the National Crime Prevention Council, the Mott Foundation, the National Governor's Association, America's Promise, the Forum for Youth Investment and others. Similarly, using our collaboration as the organizing entity, we have been successful in applying for federal funding other than FYSB's to add to our collaboration's reach and impact.

Probably the most compelling reason for me to travel from the Midwest to speak to you today was my belief that the Federal Youth Coordination Act's provisions to assist the states, in a manner similar to what FYSB has been trying to do on a limited basis, will help Iowa sustain and improve its collaboration's progress in the years to come.

The Federal Youth Coordination Act would have a major impact in Iowa as well as the nation as a whole.

In Iowa, we are trying to break down barriers between programs that can lead to service gaps and overly complex service planning and service delivery processes.

If a youth has an abusive parent, has severe emotional disorders, exhibits behavior problems and is failing in school, is abusing substances, and has been committing delinquent acts, we should not be intervening with a separate and independent response to each of his or her problems. And yet, discipline-specific responses are often all that are available.

We also should not be establishing a separate collaboration at the local or state level to address each type of youth-at-risk problem area. And yet, that is what federal programs often require states to do, and it is often what both state and federal programs require communities to do. In Iowa, we pretend to make jokes about “colliding community collaborations,” but we do this out of frustration and guilt and not because we think it is funny.

It is only in communities that true service coordination at the case level can really occur, but local abilities to achieve such coordination is limited by state and federal categorical programs that have different-sounding goals and that dictate separate eligibility criteria, duplicative or disparate program or case planning steps, different reporting requirements and so on and so on. Community-level coordination should be a natural outgrowth of coordination at the state and federal levels. Similarly, state level efforts to assist local coordination need federal leadership to coordinate policies and program requirements from different federal agencies. And, such federal coordination efforts should be undertaken in a way that maximizes parallel state coordination capacities.

This is one of the main reasons I believe the Federal Youth Coordination Act would have a major impact in Iowa as well as the nation as a whole. Communities and their families and children will benefit if federal agencies start doing a better job of coordinating their own policies and also provide real supports to state coordination efforts and not just mandates or instructions for state-level collaborations.

I’d like to end my comments with one example. States are now receiving mandates or guidelines from different federal agencies that are meant to assure results-based or evidenced-based or research-based youth programs and services. Unfortunately, what such good-sounding words mean to one federal agency may not mean the same thing to another. Local or state efforts that are attempting to improve interventions by coordinating resources from, for example, special education funds with mental health funds with substance abuse treatment funds with juvenile justice dollars may get stalled over a simple lack of agreement on how to define, measure or report program quality.

This is only one type of issue that we are dealing with in Iowa and for which we need help from the federal level to address. This is also the kind of problem that I see the Federal Youth Coordination Act can help to solve if it is passed and then implemented with care and with an eye on the common goals of our many federal, state and local programs for children, youth and families.

In closing, I would like to point out that I have been doing this work under both democratic and republican administrations. I see my colleagues in other states doing similar work under both democratic and republican governors. This is clearly not a partisan issue. Improving coordination is an ongoing issue that transcends party lines. Using our resources on children and youth in the most effective and efficient manner is something all of us can stand behind. It is wonderful to see both democratic and republican members of Congress working together on this legislation—it reinforces the central collaborative message of the legislation itself. This work is long overdue. Please pass the Federal Youth Coordination Act.

Thank you for your time and your efforts to help our nation’s children.

Chairman TIBERI. That was the best I have ever seen.

[Laughter.]

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Ms. Shubilla.

**STATEMENT OF LAURA SHUBILLA, PRESIDENT,
PHILADELPHIA YOUTH NETWORK, PHILADELPHIA, PA**

Ms. SHUBILLA. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee. I want to begin by thanking you and the Members of the Subcommittee for your leadership on these important issues.

I appreciate this opportunity to describe some of our work in Philadelphia for those coordinated multi-agency approaches that serve our young people, and to address how the principles of the Federal Youth Coordination Act can assist local effort.

I will also reflect on how our work mirrors and reinforces some of the key principles of the report of the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, as well as a memo initiated by the Campaign for Youth that supports the Federal Youth Coordination Act and other important youth policies.

Let me start by sharing some good news. In Philadelphia, we are making real progress and building bridges across programs and agencies in pursuit of a coordinated system of youth services.

To a considerable extent, our successes have their roots in the implementation of the Workforce Investment Act. I believe that in many ways, we have done what the Congress expected us to do when WIA was passed back in 1998, by bringing together senior officials from the school district, the city's child welfare agency, the family court, together with leading employers, university officials, and youth advocates.

We have created our own local youth development council. We have developed Workforce Investment Board sponsored requests for proposals for comprehensive youth services that incorporate investments from Federal programs, foundations, the school district, and private employers.

Rarely is an RFP released in Philadelphia that does not incorporate funding from more than one source. This has not always been the case.

We have used Chafee, TANF and Workforce Investment Act support for neighborhood based youth centers that provide education, training and employment services for out of school youth, court involved youth, and youth aging out of the foster care system.

We have coordinated Workforce Investment Board, city and school district funding to support small alternative high schools designed to address the needs of struggling students and out of school youth.

We are proud of our history of collaboration. However, the fact remains that differing definitions, eligibilities and outcomes that characterize much Federal youth programming continues to present significant challenges for youth and their families as they attempt to assess needed programs and services, and for local leaders as they attempt to collaborate and leverage resources.

Yesterday was an interesting example of this for me. In the morning, I received a call from a young woman nearly in tears from frustration, trying to go back to school, find work, and get in touch with other services that she needed. Her refrain throughout the entire conversation was I'm really, really trying, I promise.

Then in the afternoon, my colleagues and I spent several hours discussing an intake system for our new youth system, that would be responsive to four funding sources included in the center, that would not require youth, like the young woman I just spoke about, to be overwhelmed by paperwork and eligibility criteria.

Whether it is designing procedures or supporting the young man I met recently who came back from a juvenile detention facility with 9 months of academic work that did not translate into high school credit, we simply have to do a better job of making these systems more transparent and accessible.

That is why I believe the Federal Youth Coordination Act represents such an important opportunity. With the help of the Youth

Development Council and input from state and local practitioners, I believe that many of these challenges can be overcome.

A final big picture thought on cross program coordination and communication. The kinds of positive pathways we are trying to produce for struggling students and out of school youth should be part of the national conversation on high school reform.

As we re-engineer the educational system, if we ignore the youth who are already disengaged from it or have one foot out the door, which can be half of all high school young people in some communities, then we have already written off hundreds of thousands of the very young people our programs are attempting to serve.

My second point is the power of work and other real world learning experiences for youth, and the support that they need at a local level to make sure that we can provide these opportunities for as many youth as need them.

Using the Workforce Investment Board and its Youth Council as a platform, we have created a city-wide system for youth workforce development that we call WorkReady Philadelphia. Through WorkReady, we have built an expanding network of committed employers that hire hundreds of young people each year in unsubsidized internships.

We have seen major corporations like Lockheed-Martin, Citizens Bank, Lincoln Financial Group, and Independence Blue Cross make major contributions of time, energy and money to support work experiences for disadvantaged youth.

Our experience underscores the value of collaboration on model programs and projects that focus on special populations, which would be a key role of the Federal Youth Coordination Act Youth Development Council.

Once again, there is more we could and should be doing. Therefore, the creation of the Youth Development Council could also be of immense help by identifying employer incentives to hire and mentor young people, supporting intermediaries that connect employers to youth in schools, supporting transportation and other support services that enable youth to participate in work and service, and expand entrepreneurial opportunities for young people.

My final point, Mr. Chairman, is the importance of believing in our young people. Contrary to public perception, most of our youth desperately want to be productive and do in fact aspire to a better life.

In Philadelphia, we know these young people, and we know that not only do they want to succeed, but they have the potential and the ability to do so.

We appreciate your leadership on this issue, and we hope that if your Act is passed, that you will continue to provide leadership, to make sure that the kinds of things that you envision in this Act actually are implemented to the agencies.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Laura Shubilla follows:]

**Statement of Laura Shubilla, President, Philadelphia Youth Network,
Philadelphia, PA**

Good morning. Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Select Education, my name is Laura Shubilla, President of the Philadelphia Youth Network. It is my privilege to appear before you this morning to discuss Philadelphia's work

to build coordinated, multi-agency approaches that serve our young people, and to address how the principles of the Federal Youth Coordination Act can assist local efforts. I will also reflect on how our work mirrors and reinforces some of the key principles of the White House Task Force on Disadvantaged Youth, including efforts to establish coordination across federal programs, as well as a memo initiated by the Campaign for Youth and signed by over 250 organizations supporting the Federal Youth Coordination Act and other important youth policies. Finally, I will offer suggestions to the Committee concerning recommendations for your consideration that can help us to produce better outcomes for our young people.

While I am here today speaking on behalf of the Philadelphia Youth Network, I want to acknowledge the thousands of organizations and individuals across the country that work tirelessly to address the needs of our young people. I hope that in presenting our experience in Philadelphia, we honor and, at least in some small way, represent their efforts as well.

Let me begin by recognizing and thanking the Subcommittee for its leadership in holding this hearing on such a vital issue. The Report of the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth and the Federal Youth Coordination Act are powerful testaments to the importance of this topic. Rarely do social, economic and moral imperatives align so clearly, and urge our attention and action. Therefore, the Committee's focus is both timely and extraordinarily important. I hope that this hearing will be the first of many that will bring much needed attention to the needs of some of our most vulnerable youth, and also shed light on the great potential that these young people have to become active and productive citizens who can help to drive the nation's future growth.

The Philadelphia Youth Network is a non-profit youth intermediary organization that oversees approximately \$18M annually from government, foundation and private investments, dedicated to providing programs and services to almost 10,000 young people each year through WorkReady Philadelphia, our City's comprehensive youth workforce system. We manage Workforce Investment Act (WIA) youth funding under contract to the Philadelphia Workforce Investment Board and staff its Youth Council. We also oversee internships supported by the William Penn Foundation and other area philanthropies, and are privileged to serve as the managing partner for Philadelphia's Youth Transition Funders Group program, supported by the Gates, Carnegie, Mott and William Penn Foundations, that promotes enhanced opportunities for struggling students and disconnected youth. I will focus my remarks on specific aspects of Philadelphia's cross-sector collaboration, and suggest how Congressional action could strengthen our efforts.

I would first like to emphasize the clear need for greater coordination, flexibility and communication within and between major youth-oriented public programs, including education, workforce development and juvenile justice. Our Philadelphia experience underscores the importance of such efforts, and clearly reinforces the topic of coordination being addressed today.

Leaders in Philadelphia have worked very hard to use all available program flexibility to bring together a wide variety of system partners that invest funds from City government, the school district, local foundations and private employers, with the goal of serving all youth within one comprehensive system. I'll give you several examples of how we do this:

- (1) First, the advent of WIA enabled the City to build a network of partners, including the schools, juvenile justice and foster care agencies, to focus on the needs of disconnected youth with the goal of identifying approaches that are both more efficient and more effective. In fact, the Workforce Investment Board (WIB) and its Youth Council issue requests for proposals that leverage multiple funding streams, e.g. WIA, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), school district, foundation and private sector dollars, to provide services critical to reengaging disconnected youth in education and employment, and preparing these young people for success in education, employment and life. This is the type of collaboration that the Federal Youth Coordination Act can identify and encourage.

- (2) We are working closely with the City's school system to align and integrate our efforts in support of disconnected youth with broader high school reform activities, including joint planning of smaller, alternative high schools, and efforts to ensure that academic programs at juvenile placement facilities are aligned with school district standards so that youth receive credit for their work when returning to high school. Furthermore, because the school district values the rigor of programming offered through WIB and Youth Council funding, more than 32,000 Philadelphia youth have received academic credit for work completed during their summer and year-round programs funded by WIA and TANF.

- (3) WIA funding is also being utilized to support organizations who are administering schools for over-age, under-credentialed youth and former dropouts who are trying to return to earn a high school diploma. This funding augments school district dollars, and enables organizations to provide much needed employment and wrap-around services that are often critical to success.
- (4) Through leadership of the City's Department of Human Services and the WIB, we are pooling funding from multiple sources, e.g. WIA, TANF and Chafee program grants, to support youth centers where we provide access to work experience, education and training for out-of-school, court-involved and foster care youth.
- (5) As part of our Youth Transitions Funders Group grant, Philadelphia is looking closely at strategies to better serve low literate learners in traditional and non-traditional settings. We have found that literacy is often the critical barrier for youth seeking to reconnect to education or training programs. This effort will yield lessons and best practices for working with older youth, and has the potential to provide important professional development models for educators.
- (6) Also with support from the William Penn Foundation and the Youth Transition Funders Group, Philadelphia is pursuing data integration strategies that will analyze youth information across the School District and all relevant city agencies to better define the scale and characteristics of the out-of-school youth population. One key aim of this discussion is to understand and address the differing definitions for dropouts and out-of-school youth that have the potential to hamper access to needed programs and services. In this regard, we applaud efforts by the National Governors Association to build support for uniform definitions of high school graduation and dropout status.
- (7) Additionally, while we are discussing coordination, I would like to mention the needs of Philadelphia's 1,000 youth who each year exit juvenile placement facilities, and that action on the bipartisan Second Chance Act would strengthen collaboration between state and local youth-serving systems to support their successful reintegration into their communities.

We are proud of our history of collaboration and are eager to share with other localities what we have learned about leveraging funds to reconnect youth to positive pathways. However, the fact remains that the differing definitions, eligibilities and outcomes that characterize much federal youth programming continue to present significant challenges for youth and their families as they attempt to access needed programs and services. We simply have to do a better job of making these systems more transparent and accessible.

To this end, I believe that the Federal Youth Coordination Act represents an important opportunity to rationalize eligibility requirements, programmatic definitions and performance measures that too-often preclude the kinds of efficiencies that we all want to see in public programs. Clearly, the Act's Youth Development Council would be an excellent vehicle to address this goal.

In a broader sense, I also urge that the Subcommittee consider the issues of disconnected youth as an integral part of overall high school reform efforts. At present, the state- and national-level high school reform conversations are focused on increasing academic rigor, which is a laudable goal and critical for every student. But we must ensure that schools, districts, and states are held accountable for improving graduation rates as they work to improve academic achievement. Efforts towards this goal could be enhanced by strategies and incentives for school districts to engage multiple partners and funding streams to create menus of educational options designed for all youth, with particular attention to appropriate learning environments for students who are struggling, who have multiple barriers to success, and for those who have disconnected but wish to re-engage.

Finally on this point, even the most effective, efficient and collaborative approach to youth service delivery cannot overcome chronic under-funding of programs and services for disconnected youth. Therefore, appreciating the profound fiscal challenges faced by the Congress and the Administration, I hope that you will find the means to make levels of public investment that would enable us to expand efforts to help more disconnected youth successfully enter our nation's economic mainstream.

My next point concerns Philadelphia's successes in building cross-sector partnerships to provide work experience and service opportunities for disadvantaged youth. Our experience underscores the value of public agency collaboration on model programs and projects that focus on special populations, which is a key role of the Youth Development Council that would be authorized by the Federal Youth Coordinating Act.

Research demonstrates conclusively that work experience during the high school years yields long-term employment and earnings benefits. In Philadelphia, we have seen first hand the power that work and service can have to create life-changing benefits for young people. Our WorkReady Philadelphia campaign has produced numerous examples of area employers, city government, foundations and community organizations mobilizing to host interns and provide employment support to more than 6,000 young people each year. A few examples include:

- (1) Lockheed Martin Integrated Systems and Solution has hired three dozen IT registered apprentices, recruited from students enrolled in a half-dozen Philadelphia high schools;
- (2) St. Christopher's Hospital for Children has an extraordinary program that has introduced hundreds of local high school students to a range of health-related occupations, and has been responsible for inspiring dozens of young people to pursue health careers;
- (3) Citizens Bank and Lincoln Financial Group have offered dozens of young interns opportunities for summer employment and have contributed over \$100,000 to support aspects of WorkReady Philadelphia; and
- (4) We are working with Philadelphia's Coca-Cola Bottling Company, Herr's Snack Foods and ShopRite Stores to design a secondary merchandising enterprise that will prepare out-of-school youth and juvenile offenders for jobs and careers in a number of related industries.

If the Federal Youth Coordination Act is passed, it would provide a mechanism, via the Youth Development Council, for sharing information on Philadelphia's successes and lessons learned, including the WorkReady Philadelphia model for possible dissemination to other states and localities.

While the power of work for youth is clear, research also tells us that young people in urban and rural areas too often face challenges in finding jobs and therefore lose out on its potential benefits. We experience this directly in Philadelphia, as we are forced to turn away thousands of young people each year who seek jobs but can't be accommodated for want of funded slots. Therefore, the Youth Development Council could also provide invaluable assistance by:

- (1) Identifying employer incentives to hire and mentor young people;
- (2) Supporting intermediaries and other organizations that connect employers to youth and schools;
- (3) Supporting transportation and other support services that enable youth to participate in work experience, community service and service learning, and other forms of field-based learning that have such powerful benefits; and
- (4) Expanding entrepreneurial opportunities that have the potential both to provide work experiences for our youth and to produce valuable community services or products.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me share what I believe is perhaps the most important underlying message of our work. Contrary to public perception, most of these youth desperately want to be productive, and aspire to a better life. In Philadelphia, we know that these young people not only want to succeed, but that they have the potential and ability to do so. We know this because:

- (1) More than 15,000 young people each year seek summer and year-round programs through WorkReady Philadelphia, far more than can possibly be served with available resources. These young people produce remarkable projects and portfolios that earn them academic credit towards high school graduation, and result in valuable work experience and employer connections;
- (2) Young people participating in WIA-funded and other WorkReady Philadelphia programs design and administer a Youth Satisfaction Survey to their peers, in order to elicit recommendations that enable funded agencies to continue to make improvements in their programs;
- (3) Hundreds of out-of-school youth enroll in our neighborhood based youth centers eager to improve their employment and earnings prospects through work experience, education and training; and
- (4) When given the chance, literally thousands of former high school dropouts return to alternative educational opportunities because experience has taught them how much they need a high school credential and additional education to earn a living. For example, when three small alternative high schools opened recently, with the capacity to serve 450 students, they were deluged with almost five times that many applications for admission.

These are but a few examples of young people who are seeking to learn, earn and grow into productive employees and self-sufficient citizens.

Your voices can contribute immeasurably to the public discussion on these issues by delivering this essential message about young people. Please use every available opportunity: every relevant piece of legislation, every town meeting, every speech;

to counter the prevailing stereotypes of our young people and to express the reality that they have the potential to become the active and productive citizens that we all want and need them to be.

Furthermore, please continue to lend your leadership to the Act once it is passed. The only way that The Federal Youth Coordination Act will be effective is if leadership from each agency sends representatives who are willing to understand each other's systems and navigate the various governing rules and regulations to actually implement the desired changes. This leadership will need to be ongoing and persistent as this kind of system integration takes patience and creativity. If our experience in Philadelphia has taught us nothing else about systems coordination, it is that a few determined people in each agency can make great things happen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, for the opportunity to appear before you to discuss the need to promote collaborative, multi-partner approaches for disconnected youth. Our Philadelphia experience validates and strongly reinforces the Federal Youth Coordination Act's goal to strengthen coordination and communication across federal, state, and local government agencies and funding streams. I applaud your efforts, and look forward to working with you to elevate these issues, and to help our young people to realize their potential as involved and contributing citizens.

Memo on Reconnecting Our Youth
from A Coalition of Voices from the Field

The undersigned organizations represent youth practitioners, policy makers, educators, advocates, community and faith-based institutions, and others who are concerned about the future for the millions of young people who have fallen outside of the education and labor market mainstreams with little opportunity to reconnect. As a coalition we elevate this situation to the President's attention and advance a set of recommendations. We stand willing to work with the President, his administration, and the Congress to advance an agenda that will restore hope and promise to these youth.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL

Academy for Educational Development: Center for Youth Development and Policy Research
Alliance for Children and Families
Alliance for Excellent Education
American Youth Policy Forum
Big Brothers Big Sisters of America
Camp Fire USA
Center for Law and Social Policy
Chesapeake Center for Youth Development
Child Welfare League of America
Coalition for Juvenile Justice
Coalition of Community Foundations for Youth
Connect for Kids
Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators
Eckerd Youth Alternatives
Education Works
Forum for Youth Investment
Friends of the Children
Jobs for the Future
Justice Policy Institute
Kids Project
Learning Disabilities Association of America
National Association of Service and Conservation Corps
National Association of Street Schools
National Association of Students Against Violence Everywhere
National Association of Youth Service Consultants
National Collaboration for Youth
National Council on Employment Policy
National Education Association
National Foster Care Coalition
National Independent Living Association
National Institute on Out of School Time
National Mental Health Association

National Network for Youth
 National Organization on Adolescent Pregnancy, Parenting and Prevention
 National Partnership for Careers in Law, Public Safety, Corrections and Security
 National Youth Advocate Program
 National Youth Employment Coalition
 National Youth Leadership Council
 New England Network for Child, Youth & Family Services
 New Ways to Work
 Northwest Youth Corps
 Pacific News Service/New California Media
 Puerto Rican Youth Development and Resource Center, Inc.
 Sar Levitan Center for Social Policy Studies
 School Social Work Association of America
 Search Institute
 Society for Research in Child Development
 SOS Children's Villages-UAS
 The Council for Parent Attorneys and Advocates, Inc.
 The First Place Fund for Youth
 US Conference of Mayors
 Western States Youth Services Network
 Youth Build USA
 Youth Development Institute
 Youth Law Center
 Youth Service America

STATE, TRIBE, AND LOCAL

Alaska

Alaska Youth Corps
 Serve Alaska Youth Corps
 Southeast Alaska Guidance Associations/Serve

Arizona

Children's Action Alliance
 Coconino County Juvenile Court Services
 Run Drugs Out of Town Run, Inc.
 Youth Corps of Southern Arizona

California

Bridge of Faith
 California Conservation Corps
 California Youth Connection
 Conservation Corps of Long Beach
 Diogenes Youth Services, Inc.
 Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission
 Los Angeles Youth Network
 Marin Conservation Corps
 Orange County Conservation Corps and YouthBuild Program
 Reality House West, Inc.
 Riverside County Economic Development Agency
 Sacramento Local Conservation Corps
 San Jose Conservation Corps
 Southwest Youth Corps
 Tulare County Conservation Corps
 Thomas Jefferson Youth Organizers
 Workforce Development Board of Riverside County
 Youth Justice Coalition

Colorado

Colorado Youth Corps Association
 Larimer County Youth Conservation Corps
 Mile High Youth Corps
 Southwest Youth Corps
 Urban Peak
 Western Colorado Conservation Corps

Connecticut

Connecticut Association of Nonprofits
 Lighthouse After School Program
 Pride Cultural Center

Southend Community Services, Inc.
United Services, Inc.

District of Columbia

City Year Washington DC
Washington Partners, LLC

Florida

Centro Campesino Farmworker Center Inc.
Florida's Children First
Kids@Home, Inc.
The Children's Services Council of Broward County
The Children's Trust
Westcoast School for Human Development

Georgia

Barton Child Law and Policy Clinic
Communities in Schools of Colquitt County, Inc.
Fulton Atlanta Community Action Authority, Inc.
Southern Juvenile Defender Center
United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta

Hawaii

Hale 'Opio Kaua'I

Illinois

Cabrini Connections
Comprehensive Community Solutions, Inc.
Emerson Park Development Corporation
Futures Unlimited, Inc.
Prologue Westside Youth Build
Uhlich Children's Advantage Network
Youth Conservation Corps, Inc.

Indiana

Crisis Center, Inc
Indiana Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group
Indiana Juvenile Justice Task Force, Inc.
The Incorporated Concord School

Kansas

Children and Family Services

Louisiana

NZBC Urban Corporation

Maine

Maine Children's Alliance
Maine Independence Corps

Maryland

Advocates for Children and Youth
Community Coalition for Education Options
Mental Health Association of Montgomery County
Public Justice Center

Massachusetts

Cambridge Housing Authority
Center for Youth Development and Education
Youth Voice Collaborative, YWCA Boston
YWCA of Western Massachusetts

Michigan

Albion Community Foundation
Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency
Michigan's Children
Michigan League for Human Services
Sault Ste. Marie Area Public Schools
Sault Tribe Youth Education & Activities

Minnesota

Achieve! Minneapolis
 Hearthstone of Minnesota
 McLeod Treatment Programs, Inc.
 Minnesota Conservation Corps
 Minnesota Council on Child Caring Agencies
 Workforce Development, Inc.
 Youth and Adult Programs, Orono Community Education

Mississippi

AIRS

Missouri

Accion Social Comunitaria
 Citizens for Missouri's Children
 Operation Weed & Seed
 Youth Education and Health in Souldard

Montana

Discovery House
 Montana Conservation Corps

Nebraska

Interchurch Ministries of Nebraska
 Panhandle Community Service

Nevada

Southern Nevada Workforce Investment Board

New Hampshire

Kearsarge Assets Network, Inc.
 Odyssey House Executive Offices
 Odyssey Youth Rebuild
 New Jersey
 Gloucester County Economic Development Workforce Investment Board
 New Jersey Youth Corps of Trenton
 The Work Group
 Volunteer Center of Monmouth County

New Mexico

Education and Workforce Consultants
 Forest Guild
 Indio Hispano Academy of Agricultural Arts & Sciences
 Pueblo of Acoma

New York

Advocates for Children of New York, Inc.
 Buckeye Community Hope Foundation
 Chautauqua Home Rehabilitation and Improvement Corporation
 Community of Unity
 EAC, Inc.
 Empire State Coalition of Youth and Family Services
 Family Recovery Center
 Good Shepherd Services
 Neighborhood Family Services Coalition
 Niagara County Workforce Investment Act Youth Council
 Niagara County Youth Bureau
 Schenectady County Center for Juvenile Justice
 Lighthouse Youth Services
 West Seneca Youth Bureau
 WSOS Community Action Commission, Inc.
 Youth Communication/New York
 Youth Resource Development Corporation

North Carolina

Haven House

Ohio

Juvenile Justice Coalition of Ohio
 Native Village Publications

Ohio Youth Advocate Program

Oregon

Juvenile Rights Project

Washington

Northwest Service Academy

Pennsylvania

Episcopal Community Services

Pathways

Philadelphia Citizens for Children and Youth

Philadelphia Youth Network

South Carolina

Communities in Schools of Lancaster

Sumter County YouthBuild

Tennessee

Jackson State Community College

Memphis Shelby Crime Commission

Memphis Ten Point Coalition

Texas

American YouthWorks

Communities in Schools—Central Texas Inc.

Houston Metropolitan Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health

Montgomery County Youth Services

St. Jude's Ranch for Children

Texas Network of Youth Services

Youth Works! Goodwill Industries, Central East Texas

Utah

Canyon County Youth Corps

Utah Conservation Corps

Vermont

Brattleboro Area Affordable Housing Corporation

High 5 Adventure Learning Center

Leland & Gray Union High School

Recycle North

Vermont Coalition of Runaway and Homeless Youth Programs

Windham Child Care Associate

Youth Initiative Coordinator

Virginia

Petersburg Urban Ministries

Prince & Princess, Inc.

Virginia Council of Churches

Youth Works!

Wyoming

Wyoming Children's Action Alliance, WY

Washington

Chase Youth Commission

Civic Works, Inc

Clarion County Children and Youth Services

Community Programs, Shoreline Community College

Friends of Youth

Neighborhood House

Northwest Youth Services

2 Designs, Inc.

United Way of Kitsap County

Workforce Development Council (WDC) of Seattle—King County

INDIVIDUALS

Jerry Bennet

Ana Castaneda

Robert Dobmeier

Audrey Corder

Sarah Edwards
 Lori Greenberg
 Annie Guyton
 Heather Ford
 Joe Higgins
 Curt McDermitt
 Molly Shephard
 Pat Stephens
 Julie Stevermer
 Chris Sturgis
 Dr. Sue Tenorio
 Coordinated by the Campaign for Youth

As President Bush begins his second term, he has indicated a strong interest in reforming the nation's secondary schools to ensure that every high school student graduates with proficiencies that will enable them to succeed. The undersigned organizations support the President's vision, and ask that he also commit to reforms that will improve the well-being of America's youth, in particular those who are the most vulnerable and disconnected.

This memo outlines a series of recommendations, many of which can be implemented within existing statutory and budget authority, to help the nation's most valuable resource our youth—develop into successful, self-sufficient adults. Nevertheless, we also recognize that many of the federal programs that support the transition of disadvantaged youth to productive adulthood are inadequately funded, leaving many eligible and needy youth unable to access the services, education, and supports requisite to successful transition.

According to the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth (April 2003), the National Academy of Sciences estimates that one-quarter of the adolescents in this country are at serious risk of not achieving productive adulthood. Nationally, 3 out of 10 young people who enter public high school do not graduate four years later. The graduation rate is only 50% for Hispanic, African American, and Native American youth. This situation is especially devastating in poorer urban and rural communities.

Far too many young people are in danger of being left behind. Many of these young people are already in the public's care in the foster care and/or the juvenile justice systems.

Over time, secondary school reform and innovation should transform the landscape of education delivery. Until then, each year more than a half-million youth will leave school without a high school diploma, the necessary skills to compete in the labor market, or the community supports they need to constructively engage with mainstream America. They will join the approximately 3.8 million youth between the ages of 16 and 24 who have already dropped out and are faring poorly in the labor market and in their communities.

Contrary to public perception, most of these youth desperately want to be productive, and aspire to a better life.

As a country we have the knowledge and the technology to close the skills gap and racial disparities that have persisted for far too long. It takes political leadership, effective policies, and smart investments in our young people to harness their energy and empower them with the competencies to contribute to our economic engine.

Our country cannot afford to allow so many youth to linger outside the mainstream economy, without the skills and supports they need to succeed. Effective reform must include expanding the boundaries of the traditional education system to engage communities, parents, employers, and other sectors in developing effective pathways and supports to help students remain in school and, just as important, reconnect those who have dropped out but need a second chance.

The President has made clear his commitment to leave no child behind. As he turns his attention to our high schools, he can send a powerful message that he has high expectations for every student. He can command attention from all levels of government and from American families, faith- and community-based organizations, and employers to extend their stewardship to find effective community-based solutions to this most pressing problem.

Our coalition of organizations stands ready, willing, and able to work with the President to help all young people reach their full potential. We ask for the President's consideration and support for the following recommendations.

- Use the Presidential "bully pulpit" to set a national goal to Reach Out and Reconnect our youth

- Establish an interagency National Youth Development Council, as recommended by the White House Task Force Report for Disadvantaged Youth
- Improve youth services through better outcomes evaluation and accountability
- Establish flexibility in public education funds for disadvantaged youth, to enable enrollment in the most appropriate educational environments
- Use the reauthorization of key federal programs to strengthen supports for youth transitioning to adulthood.
- Expand opportunities for youth to engage in community service and work experience
- Provide incentives and technical support to increase employer participation in developing internships, pipelines and intermediaries

Use the presidential “bully pulpit” to establish a goal to Reach Out and Reconnect our youth

By setting goals for reforming the American high schools, President Bush can send a clear message that our nation is committed to providing opportunity and support for all young people who want to constructively engage in their communities, better their academic skills, and be part of a skilled workforce. The President can ask for the active participation of governors, municipal leaders, business leaders, community and faith-based organizations, and citizens in making sure our high schools are equipped to serve struggling students and our communities stand ready to re-engage students who need another chance to get on track.

Establish a National Youth Development Council

The White House Task Force Report on Disadvantaged Youth found fragmentation among the various federal youth funding streams and in service delivery for disadvantaged youth. Lack of coordination among the Departments of Labor, Education, Health and Human Services and the Justice Department all of which have programs and policies that serve disadvantaged youth—makes it difficult for state and local programs to blend funding streams and organize service delivery at the community level. There are built-in disincentives for local coordination in the regulations and policies set by the federal departments, and the work of sorting them out at the state and local level is difficult. A National Youth Development Council, that brings together the agency Secretaries, representatives from the youth services field, employers, representatives from local government, and youth can serve to:

- Keep attention focused on the issues of disadvantaged and disconnected youth, set national priorities, measure progress on key indicators, and make policy recommendations to the White House
- Establish specific task forces or advisory committees, which include meaningful youth representation, to focus on the most pressing issues (in particular, systemic issues and policies that contribute to disparate outcomes for youth in certain subgroups) and foster cross-sector participation in advancing solutions
- Facilitate ongoing federal inter-departmental collaboration and inter-agency responses to relax the federal bureaucracy and promote the flexibility needed for more responsive solutions
- Provide interagency support for state and local government efforts to assess youth-related policies, programs, funding streams, indicators, and data in order to create and implement strategic plans for coordinated investment of federal, state, and local dollars to improve outcomes for youth

The Federal Youth Coordination Act (H.R. 856 or S. 409) bipartisan legislation to implement this and other recommendations of the White House Task Force Report was introduced in the 109th Congress by Representatives Tom Osborne (R-NE), Pete Hoekstra (R-MI), Donald Payne (D-NJ) and Harold Ford (D-TN) in the House and Senators Norm Coleman (R-MN), Mike DeWine (R-OH) and Lamar Alexander (R-TN) in Senate. White House support for this bill would bring about greater coordination and accountability among the federal agencies serving youth.

Improve youth services through better evaluation and accountability

Requiring high schools, foster care and juvenile justice agencies, and other federally funded agencies serving disadvantaged youth to publicly report their demographics, service levels, expenditures and outcomes would enable local communities to assess the magnitude of the problem, system performance and who is—and is not—effectively served, and monitor improvement over time. We recommend the following:

- Develop a uniform definition for measuring graduation and drop-out rates for local high schools, alternative schools, charter schools, school districts, and states. Establish accountability measures under the No Child Left Behind Act related to graduation rates and hold states and local systems accountable for making progress towards those benchmarks for all youth.

- Require states to monitor policies and practice that result in youth being “pushed out” or disproportionately tracked to inappropriate educational alternatives
- Require HHS to implement the National Youth in Transition Data System (the accountability system for the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program as mandated by the Foster Care Independence Act of 1999)
- Provide both incentives and sanctions to state and local child welfare and juvenile justice systems to ensure effective transitional services, including the requirement that at key risk points and before a youth is discharged, there are explicit transition plans to connect youth to key education, training, housing, and support services
- Continue to support the Runaway, Homeless, and Missing Children Protection Act of 2003, ensuring implementation of the provision requiring HHS to coordinate with the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness to develop a Report on Strategies to End Youth Homelessness

Establish flexibility in federal public education funds for disadvantaged youth, to enable enrollment in the most appropriate education environments

High schools must be reconfigured to inspire and retain students, support those who are struggling, remove the barriers to re-enrollment for youth who have dropped out, and create non-traditional alternatives for youth who can benefit from and choose to enroll in smaller, more supportive environments. Students who drop out can often be re-engaged and better served in alternative settings, like community-based academic and experiential learning programs with a demonstrated ability to achieve high school certification for these youth. Introducing accountability and flexibility in financing alternative education opportunities for older youth can allow more communities to work with their local districts to develop alternate pathways to labor market success for out-of-school youth.

- Provide incentives and technical assistance to enable public education funds (federal, state, and local) to be directed to bona fide education programs operated by qualified community-based organizations, community colleges and other entities that are better suited to serve the complex education, training, and support needs of youth seeking to reattach at the secondary level
- Strengthen the capacity of the Department of Labor (in conjunction with the Department of Education) to focus on community-based alternative education strategies with special attention to effective instructional technologies, delivery methods, workforce connections, and performance accountability
- Invest in a knowledge development effort to identify the type of instructional technologies and interventions that work for youth with low literacy levels, and facilitate the expansion of such programs
- Synchronize the performance expectations for youth served by the adult education system and the Workforce Investment Act system to remove the disincentives to blending funding in the service of youth with extremely low literacy levels

Use the reauthorization process to strengthen systems to support youth, especially those at risk, in successfully transitioning to productive adulthood

There are many key federal programs that support the transition of youth to productive adulthood. Several of these programs will be up for reauthorization in the next Congress. The recommendations offered below would improve these programs, and better enable the productive engagement of our nation's youth and a skilled workforce for employers.

Higher Education Act. Strengthen the ability of the community college system to serve as a bridge for out-of-school youth seeking to gain marketable skills and academic skills for success in post-secondary education. There are promising community college-based models that allow drop-outs to accrue credits towards high school and post secondary credentialing, sometimes concurrently.

- Strengthen the ability of the TRIO programs to provide college preparatory assistance to disadvantaged high school students and out-of-school youth enrolled in alternative community-based programs
- Open access to higher education funding for high school drop-outs who can demonstrate the ability to benefit from post-secondary education and training; expand the definition of “ability to benefit,” as proposed by the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, to include individuals without a high school diploma who have successfully completed six units of college courses
- Adopt alternative measures for determining institutional eligibility for student aid that do not discourage the enrollment of disadvantaged or higher-risk youth, rather than relying solely on student loan default rates

- Increase the amount of the maximum Pell Grant and direct the Department of Education to maintain the current formula for calculating eligibility so that hundreds of thousands of low-income young people will not be denied access to a higher education

Workforce Investment Act (H.R. 27 & S. 9). Reauthorize the WIA youth title to serve as an effective transition support system for out-of-school and extremely vulnerable youth. The WIA youth title already requires the provision of case management and follow-up for enrolled youth. Requiring an increased focus on youth who are out of school, homeless, or transitioning from foster care and the justice system can provide the necessary community infrastructure to facilitate their transition. Several other adjustments must be made to accommodate the complex needs of these youth:

- Retain the requirement for Youth Councils under WIA and encourage and enable the participation of the education and child welfare systems, runaway and homeless youth grantees, and the justice system in structuring the transition supports for vulnerable youth.
- Adjust the factors of the funding formula to ensure that the resources target communities with the greatest level of youth distress and promote increased expenditures per youth to reflect the need for more comprehensive education, training, and transition support
- Implement policies that facilitate the sharing of information on individual youth to enable better case management and outcomes tracking across systems
- Build on the capacity developed in communities that were part of the Youth Opportunities and the Young Offender demonstrations; use discretionary funding to sustain efforts in communities where successful systems innovation has occurred, which can serve as learning laboratories for the rest of the system
- Recalibrate performance measures to take into account the increased risk factors so that they don't serve as a disincentive to engaging the youth with greatest needs

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (HR 1160 & S. 667). Reauthorization provides the opportunity to refocus policy related to youth in TANF households, young parents on TANF, and TANF's role in positive youth development. Specific recommendations include:

- Make explicit to states that expenditures of TANF funds on programs that reconnect out-of-school youth to high quality education and training alternatives is in keeping with national priorities
- Encourage the connection of young parents to post-secondary vocational training and remove the disincentives inherent in the definitions of work activity and the start of the TANF time clock
- For youth in TANF households who are drop-outs or at imminent risk of dropping out, require that the Individual Responsibility Plans identify specific steps to reconnecting them to education and training support

Serious and Violent Offenders Reentry Initiative. The Second Chance Act of 2005 (H.R. 1704), introduced in the 109th Congress, would reauthorize the Serious Violent and Offenders Reentry Initiative. We encourage the Administration to support the following provisions already included in the Second Chance Act:

- Support the provision to reauthorize the juvenile offender reentry demonstration grant. With 100,000 youth exiting juvenile corrections facilities each year, it is critical to aid their successful reintegration into society through an array of services
- Support the provision that requires HHS to review the role of child protective services after arrest and establish services to preserve families
- Support the provisions authorizing mentoring grants to community-based organizations and the Federal Resource Center for Children of Prisoners

The Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (HR. 366 & S. 250). In reauthorizing the Perkins Act, the Administration can urge Congress to maintain the federal commitment to strengthening secondary career and technical education opportunities. We recommend the following:

- Make career preparation and technical education available to all secondary school students, including those in alternative school environments
- Improve the integration of learning for academic excellence through the context of careers
- Expand strategies, such as work-based learning, experiential learning, internships, career exploration, etc. for youth going to postsecondary education or training or the workforce after high school
- Improve the rigor and quality of career and technical education by ensuring a link to academic standards

- Align career and technical education curriculum to post-secondary entrance requirements

Expand youth opportunities to engage in community service and work experience

Teen employment is at its lowest rate since 1948. Economically distressed communities face serious challenges in their ability to offer young people the opportunities for gainful employment or civic engagement that are key to preparing them for a productive adulthood. The White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth (October 2003) recommended a youth service initiative that would allow older youth to “display leadership by providing opportunities for them to serve children living in high poverty areas of the United States.” Such experiences enable youth to give back to their communities and develop civic pride and leadership skills. They also provide an avenue for communities to engage youth in the community building process. We applaud the Administration’s expansion of AmeriCorps (administered by the Corporation for National and Community Service), and ask that the Administration increase its efforts to identify and support programs through AmeriCorps—such as Service and Conservation Corps and YouthBuild—that enroll youth who are low-income and/or out of school. In addition, much can be achieved by focusing the investment in Learn and Serve America on successful and innovative programs and promoting systemic change that leads to the infusion of service-learning throughout our nation’s schools, colleges, and community-and faith-based organizations.

Provide incentives and technical support to increase employer participation in developing internships, pipelines and intermediaries

The high-paying jobs and careers of the future will require levels of education, skill, and technical competence that far exceed those typical of youth coming from distressed communities and school systems. These youth are the least likely to be exposed to exciting new career opportunities in science, medicine, the arts, and other professions. Expanding their horizons and aspirations can only be accomplished by engaging the corporate sector to help young people explore workplaces and understand the demands, rewards and prerequisites for entry. The Bush administration can assist in the following ways:

- Encourage federal contractors operating in distressed communities to engage with local intermediaries in providing internships and learning opportunities for disadvantaged youth
- Through grants and technical assistance, expand the capacity of local intermediaries to work with business, the community and school systems to create pipelines and work opportunities
- Support training and technical assistance to expand employers’ capacity to better manage diversity, serve as mentors, and constructively engage in the process of preparing youth for success in the economy of the future

The President has the opportunity to fulfill America’s promise to the millions of youth who, with additional support, can make a significant contribution to our economic and social well-being. The undersigned organizations look forward to working with this Administration using our collective ability to Reach out and Reconnect our youth to a vibrant future of physical, emotional, and economic well-being.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you, and thanks for your real life examples as well. Let me try this again, Ms. Sallee.

STATEMENT OF MARGUERITE SALLEE, PRESIDENT AND CEO, AMERICA’S PROMISE—THE ALLIANCE FOR YOUTH, WASHINGTON, DC

Ms. SALLEE. Chairman Tiberi, Representative Davis, Members of the Committee, thank you for convening today’s important hearing on the coordination of Federal youth programs.

Mr. Davis, with ten brothers and sisters, maybe you could teach us a thing or two about coordinating activities and services.

I represent the America’s Promise Alliance, which is a growing group of businesses and non-profits, from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to Big Brothers and Big Sisters, and lots more.

We believe the promise of America should be available to every child, that every child should be able to realize their full potential, and too many today cannot.

I think the Federal Government has an important responsibility and a role to play, especially for the 15 million disadvantaged young people in our country today.

Today, our nation is spending over \$223 billion in Federal money across 339 youth serving programs with very little accountability and even less coordination.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that our children are too important and our money is too scarce to allow this to continue.

I come to you as someone who has dedicated my life to advancing the well being of children and youth. I have worked on children's issues both in government and in business for 30 years.

In state government, I was the Commissioner of the Department of Human Services in Tennessee. In the Federal Government, I was staff director for the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Families.

I was CEO of a child care company and CEO of a company that served troubled youth. Today, I am president of America's Promise.

I mention my background just to simply let you know that I have seen firsthand at the local, state and Federal levels the way Government programs work, but also the way they don't work.

I have lived some of the frustrations and limitations of our well meaning array of services.

Many good things, indeed, are happening. Along with the Federal Government and state governments and the good programs, we have community and faith based organizations, such as Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA, Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Camp Fire USA, and many others.

There are many Federal programs for children and youth that do provide invaluable services, but we are not having the impact that we must have.

In spite of our efforts, we know that one-third of students do not graduate from high school. We know that the foster care system designed to protect half a million of our most vulnerable children is truly broken.

We still have too many youth in our juvenile justice centers, too many using drugs, too many children having children. We know that over half of juveniles in detention have at least one psychiatric disorder, and far too many young people are killing each other or themselves, and 11 million children live below the poverty level and another 16 million live in families without basic needs, even with one income.

In short, our children and youth in today's complex world face complex challenges. We know we must do a better job helping them reach their full potential, helping them realize the promise of America.

How? I think we need to reverse the process. Children, these whole beautiful human beings should be the focus, not the myriad of programs. If you start with the child instead of the collection of programs, we might be able to figure out how best to serve them.

Our children deserve more focused attention and with the expectation of measurable results.

One thing that few of us could argue about is that young people and taxpayers would be better served if there were at least better coordination across programs.

Representative Osborne and others have introduced legislation, the Federal Youth Coordination Act. This is a strong first step.

Today, we have over 339 programs and the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth identified those. Clearly, we have lots of programs doing lots of good things, but it is either a robust system or a complicated web with no way out.

The reality is probably somewhere in between, and we can and must do better. The Federal Youth Coordination Act can help us get there.

Currently, the Federal Government has no focal point for youth. We do not have a single entity responsible for setting policy and measurable goals for our precious youth, ensuring communication and coordination across agencies and holding agencies accountable for achieving results.

H.R. 856 would change this, and would institutionalize this important focus.

This administration is good with the robust domestic policy groups, but these efforts must be ensured of continuity. We can't count on a single Administration each time to figure this out.

Government programs should add value, reduce costs, and improve outcomes. For children, we don't know if this is happening. It might come as a surprise that as a country, we actually lack a road map for helping young people reach their goals. We have no way of expecting coordination among agencies.

The Federal Youth Development Council would develop this road map and for the first time, coordinate and institutionalize that coordination and focus on children.

Coordination will not fix all of our problems, but it is certainly a good place to start, and it will build strategic bridges.

We need to identify duplication, improve efficiency, streamline red tape, and best of all, focus on the kids.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for co-sponsoring the Federal Youth Coordination Act. There are over 175 organizations throughout the country that believe this has a tremendous impact and great potential in the lives of children.

Thank you again, Congressman Osborne, for your leadership on behalf of the nation's children and youth, and specifically for writing and introducing this important bill.

As I close, I would like to recognize several organizations that have long sought a more strategic Federal youth policy, and they work daily and tirelessly to enrich the lives of young people, including the National Collaboration for Youth, Big Brothers, Big Sisters, Camp Fire USA, Communities in Schools, Child Welfare League of America, the Forum for Youth Investment, Girl Scouts of America, Volunteers of America, YMCA.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we need your leadership. The children need your leadership. Please do everything you can to enact the Federal Youth Coordination Act. You have the ability and the responsibility to act, to be a leader in the House and an example to the Senate.

Our children are too important and our money is too scarce not to pass this legislation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Marguerite Sallee follows:]

Statement of Marguerite W. Sallee, President and CEO, America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth, Washington, DC

Chairman Tiberi, Representative Hinojosa, members of the Committee, thank you for convening today's hearing on the coordination of federal youth programs. I am honored to speak with you today on behalf of a growing alliance of businesses and nonprofit organizations, many of which are here today, on this important issue.

I come to you as someone who has dedicated my life to advancing the well-being of children and youth, and has worked in and out of government and the corporate sector for thirty years. At the state level, I had the honor of serving as Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Human Services after leading then-Governor Lamar Alexander's statewide "Healthy Children Initiative." At the federal level, I had the pleasure of serving as Staff Director for the Senate Subcommittee on Children and Families. I am currently proud to serve as President and CEO of America's Promise—The Alliance for Youth, founded by General Colin Powell to strengthen the voice for young people throughout the country.

I make reference to my background because I want you to know the different ways in which I have experienced government, and specifically how government serves our children. There are many federal programs for children and youth that provide invaluable services for our kids. Over 1.2 million children have a safe place to go after school while their parents are working because of federal support for 21st Century Community Learning Centers. In 2004, nearly one million children in poverty received comprehensive services preparing them for school and life through Head Start. And President Bush plans to provide 100,000 children of incarcerated parents with the love of a caring adult mentor through the Mentoring Children of Prisoners program, and we are well on our way towards achieving the president's goal.

But despite all of the efforts of the federal government, combined with the efforts of state governments, community and faith based organizations such as Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCAs, Big Brothers Big Sisters, Camp Fire USA and countless others, we know that about one-third of students do not graduate from high school; we know that there are more than 132,000 youth ages 15–19 in foster care who are going to "age-out" of the system, many of whom will lack a diploma, health care, or even a place to live.¹ And we know that there are over 104,000 juveniles who are detained, incarcerated or placed in residential facilities,² and President Bush's New Freedom Commission on Mental health reports that well over half juveniles in detention of at least one psychiatric disorder.³ In short, we know that children and youth still face multifaceted challenges, and we know we can do a better job of helping them to reach their full potential.

But how? In these halls of Congress, we debate the mechanics of various federal programs for youth, and rightfully so. Our children and youth deserve more attention. But one thing that few people can argue with, is that young people and taxpayers—would be better served if there were better coordination among federal youth programs. Representative Osborne has introduced legislation, the Federal Youth Coordination Act, that offers a strong first step toward a more efficient and effective response to the challenges facing disadvantaged youth.

As you know, H.R. 856 was written to implement the recommendations of the White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, convened by President Bush to develop a more comprehensive federal youth policy. The Task Force identified fed-

¹According to national research, 55 percent of youth aging out of foster care will leave the system without a high school diploma, 44 percent of them will have trouble obtaining health care, more than half of the young women will have given birth, and a quarter will be homeless. See Annie E. Casey Foundation (2004). Kids Count Data Book 2004. Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation, 7–8. Available on-line at <http://www.aecf.org/kidscount/databook/essay.htm>.

²Ibid., 50.

³President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health (2003). Achieving the Promise: Transforming Mental Health Care in America. President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health. Washington, DC, 32. Available on-line at www.mentalhealthcommission.gov.

eral youth programs spread across 12 Departments.⁴ It found 145 federal youth programs offering 11 or more services,⁵ and 112 programs serving 16 or more target populations.⁶ Clearly, we have numerous federal youth programs serving a multitude of youth populations with a variety of activities. This is either a robust system, or a complicated web. The reality is that it is probably somewhere in between. We can and must do better, and the Federal Youth Coordination Act will help to get us there.

Currently, the federal government lacks a focal point for youth. We do not have a single entity responsible for setting policy and measurable goals for youth, ensuring communication and coordination across agencies, and holding agencies accountable for achieving results.

H.R. 856 would change this by establishing the Federal Youth Development Council. This council would be composed of Department Secretaries and directed by Congress to improve communication among federal agencies serving similar or the same populations of youth. It would also assess the needs of youth and develop a comprehensive plan including quantifiable five-year goals and common indicators of youth well-being and assist agencies in coordinating their efforts to achieve results.

Through its annual report to Congress, the council would compile a comprehensive review of federal research on youth well-being, making “what we know” about youth and youth programs more transparent to Congress and the American people. This, in turn, would help Congress make more strategic decisions in the future. The report would also provide recommendations to Congress on ways to better integrate policies across agencies, particularly highlighting statutory barriers to effective coordination.

And pending the availability of appropriations, the Council would provide assistance to States and localities to support State-level coordination efforts, giving priority to States that have already initiated interagency coordination focused on youth.

If this bill only improved federal coordination, it would be a good thing. If this bill only improved state coordination, that would be a good thing too. But by doing both of these things together, the Federal Youth Coordination Act is uniquely valuable. It also sends an important message to States that they, in turn, should be connecting to city and county level collaborative efforts. In so doing, the federal government would provide leadership reinforcing work by the National Conference of State Legislators and the National Governors Association, both of which have recently launched efforts to support state youth collaboration.

It might come as a surprise to you that, as a country, we lack a roadmap for helping young people reach the goals we hope they will achieve. We have no way of directing coordination among agencies that provide different services to the same populations of youth, so that individual funding streams are, in the words of the White House Task Force, “integrated in ways that add value, reduce cost, and improve outcomes for disadvantaged youth.”⁷ The Federal Youth Development Council will develop this roadmap, and for the first time, coordinate agency efforts toward a common destination.

While some may question whether or not the council called for by this bill will truly be able to complete the Herculean task of integrating the work of federal agencies, we have every reason to believe the Federal Youth Coordination Act is a strong step in the right direction. The continued leadership of this Committee is vital for this to take place. By holding annual hearings, perhaps centered on the annual report to be provided by the council, this Committee will provide the extra accountability necessary to ensure success.

The bottom line is this: coordination won’t simply happen by telling agencies to coordinate. Federal agencies and staff, just like all of us in the youth serving arena, are rightfully busy implementing their own programs and strategies and have little time to “come up for air” and look at the broader picture. This notwithstanding, it is not okay that we allow children to age out of the foster care system without health care or even a place to live when government programs already provide both. And considering the existence of government funded mental health programs, it is questionable that we incarcerate juveniles with mental health problems but make

⁴ White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth (2003). The White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth Final Report. Washington, DC: White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, 30. Available on-line at <http://www.ncfy.com/whreport.htm>.

⁵ White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth (2003). Preliminary Report on Findings for the Federal Response to Disadvantaged Youth. Washington, DC: White House Task Force for Disadvantaged Youth, 25. Available on-line at <http://www.ncfy.com/whreport.htm>.

⁶ Ibid., 23.

⁷ Ibid., 25.

little attempt to address this problem, let alone effectively integrating these youth back into the community.

Coordination will not fix all of these and other problems, but especially during times where fiscal discipline guides decision making, improved coordination is a good place to start. To do this, we need Congress to empower a staffed entity whose full-time responsibility is building strategic bridges among federal agencies. We need it to identify duplication of federal efforts and areas for improved efficiency, and direct interagency efforts to streamline unnecessary red tape and produce better results for kids.

The concept of enhancing federal coordination is not a new one. Congress has led much more intense efforts to address other national priorities, such as the establishment of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the newly established National Intelligence Director. Just as our country needs a coordinated effort to combat drugs and keep us safe from terrorism, we need a comprehensive strategy to ensure that those who will lead our country have the resources to be the leaders we need them to be. While the Federal Youth Coordination Act does not go as far as these two reform efforts, it is nonetheless a strong and important step toward a federal youth policy that is comprehensive, coordinated, and accountable.

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for co-sponsoring the Federal Youth Coordination Act, as I and over 100 organizations throughout the country believe it has tremendous potential for improving the lives of children. I would also like to offer special thanks to Mr. Osborne for your leadership on behalf of the nation's children and youth, and specifically for writing and introducing this important bill. I also wish to recognize Representatives Ford, Hoekstra, Norwood, Payne and Peterson for their co-sponsorship. Finally, I would like to recognize a few of the organizations that have long sought a more strategic federal youth policy, and serve daily to enrich the lives of young people, including the National Collaboration for Youth, Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, Camp Fire USA, Communities in Schools, Child Welfare League of America, Forum for Youth Investment, Girl Scouts of America, Volunteers of America and YMCA of the USA. The work of faith and community based organizations such as these, as well as private foundations and generous corporations which have followed the federal government's lead by investing in collaborative efforts, leaves no doubt that the Federal Youth Coordination Act would leverage significant investments within the private sector.

Many feel that Washington is an increasingly partisan city. But we know, and you demonstrate, that when it comes to the nation's children, leaders on both sides of the aisle come together for what's right for our country, and its future. I'd like to leave you with the words of Terri Harrak, a young woman who aged out of the foster care system. Terri said:

I believe federal agencies are doing the best they can to provide services for young people, but there is no coordination. I would go to one place for healthcare, run to another place for unemployment, go somewhere else for education, run all around town and fill out all kinds of forms, when one person just could have told me about all the programs together. If I would've gone to get healthcare, or emergency food stamps, at 18 years old, I didn't even know how to use them and had no place to put them. If someone would've told me about the federal transitional living program that was four miles away from where I was living in the hospital, I could have saved a year of homelessness.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, children like Terri need your leadership. Please act swiftly to enact the Federal Youth Coordination Act. We have made great strides in a number of areas, but there is still more to do. This Committee has the ability, and the responsibility, to act.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Dr. Steinberg?

STATEMENT OF DR. LAURENCE STEINBERG, DISTINGUISHED UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR, DIRECTOR, MacARTHUR FOUNDATION RESEARCH NETWORK ON ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT AND JUVENILE JUSTICE, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY, PHILADELPHIA, PA

Dr. STEINBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee.

I am a developmental psychologist who specializes in child and adolescent development, and I have done research on a variety of topics, including youth development and parent/child relationships for more than 30 years.

I am here to urge your support of the Federal Youth Coordination Act, and I say this in light of what behavioral scientists like myself as well as policymakers and practitioners concerned with young people have learned about the mental health and educational, vocational, and social service needs of America's young people.

The existing lack of coordination among programs for youth at the Federal, state and local levels is inefficient and costly, and as a consequence, many young people in need of services are not receiving them.

The way in which we organize programs for young people and agencies that serve them reflects a view of teenagers and youth that partitions their lives into isolated categories, education, workforce development, now health, juvenile justice, family life, and the like.

The boundaries between these domains with respect to funding streams and administrative structures are often entrenched in the way Government agencies are organized and funded, but in the real world, the boundaries between these different domains are very fuzzy and very fluid.

As I am sure that most of you know, different problems that afflict adolescents often cluster together. Many young people with special education needs have tremendous family problems. Many young people who suffer long bouts of unemployment during the transition from school to work perhaps have substance abuse problems. Many young people with mental illness have spent many years in the foster care system, and so on.

Yet, in many locales, individuals in the education, child welfare, foster care and mental health systems have little coordinated contact with one another, and nowhere is this more apparent than with respect to young people in the justice system, which is a group of adolescents that has been the focus of my work for the past decade.

One of the studies that I co-direct is an ongoing prospective study of nearly 1,400 serious juvenile offenders in Arizona and Pennsylvania. This study is the largest and most comprehensive of its kind ever undertaken, and I am pleased to say this is funded mainly by the U.S. Department of Justice with additional support from the two states in which we are carrying out the research and several private foundations.

Unlike most studies of juvenile offenders, ours is different in a very important way. We are not just interested in understanding their criminal behavior. We are interested in understanding their mental health, their psychological development, their education, their labor force participation, their family life, and the receipt of social services.

Here is what we are learning. We know that young people who are in the justice system are there because they have violated the law, but our research shows that this population of young people

can be defined by much more than their illegal or anti-social behavior.

A disproportionate number of them have had contact with the foster care system at some point in time. A disproportionate number of them have been abused or neglected. A disproportionate number of them have serious mental health problems. A disproportionate number of them have substance abuse or substance dependency.

In other words, these kids whom we classify as juvenile offenders could just as easily be classified as special education students, victims of child abuse, individuals with mental illness, individuals with substance abuse problems, and so on.

Because of the artificial way in which we classify them, the kids in the juvenile justice system often don't get the services that they need, and as a result of that, when they come out of a justice system, they are very likely to re-offend.

One of the things that we are seeing in the early years of the study is one of the best predictors of re-offending among kids coming out of the justice system, having a substance abuse problem.

We can imagine how much better our justice system would work if what we did in that system was coordinated with what we did in the treatment of drugs and alcohol abuse.

Our work suggests that in order to be able to respond to juvenile crimes, we need to look at the whole adolescent, and not just at the young person's anti-social behavior.

I am confident that if you were to ask experts who specialize in education, workforce development, health care, mental health or foster care, you would receive a similar assessment.

In closing, let me just say that I think America needs an overarching youth policy in order to promote positive development and to prevent problematic functioning during this critical period of life.

I think the coordination of programs and services for young people is a very important step toward this goal, and the Federal Youth Coordination Act is a very important part of this process.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Laurence Steinberg follows:]

Statement of Dr. Laurence Steinberg, Distinguished University Professor of Psychology, Director, MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

I am the Distinguished University Professor of Psychology at Temple University in Philadelphia. I specialize in the study of psychological development during childhood and adolescence. I received my Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology from Cornell University and have held faculty positions at the University of California and the University of Wisconsin. I am a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, a former President of the Society for Research on Adolescence, and the President-Elect of the American Psychological Association's Division of Developmental Psychology. In addition, I am the Director of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Research Network on Adolescent Development and Juvenile Justice. For the past ten years, our Network has been studying how our juvenile justice policies and practices should be informed by what we know about normal and abnormal adolescent development.

I am here today to urge your support of the Federal Youth Coordination Act. I say this in light of what behavioral scientists like myself, as well as policy-makers and practitioners concerned with the development of American youth, have learned about the mental health, educational, vocational, and social service needs of our country's young people. The existing lack of coordination of programs for youth, at

the federal, state, and local levels is inefficient and costly, and as a consequence, many young people in need of services are not receiving them.

Currently, programs for youth are administered by a wide array of agencies, many of which do not communicate with one another. The organization of these agencies reflects a view of young people that partitions their lives into isolated categories—education, workforce development, mental health, juvenile justice, family life, and the like. Although the boundaries between these life domains with respect to funding streams and administrative structures are often entrenched in the ways in which governmental agencies are organized and funded, in the real world these boundaries are fuzzy and fluid. As I am sure you know, different problems that often afflict adolescents tend to cluster together. Many young people with special education needs have tremendous family problems. Many young people who suffer long bouts of unemployment during the transition from school to work also have substance abuse problems. Many young people who suffer from mental illness have spent years within the foster care system, and so on. And yet, in many locales, individuals in the education, child welfare, foster care, and mental health systems have little coordinated contact with one another.

Nowhere is this overlap more apparent than with respect to young people in the justice system, a category of adolescents that has been the focus of my work for the past decade. One of our Network's major research activities is an ongoing prospective study of nearly 1,400 serious juvenile offenders in Arizona and Pennsylvania. This study, the largest and most comprehensive of its kind ever undertaken, is funded mainly by the U.S. Department of Justice, with additional support from the two states in which the study is being carried out as well as several private foundations. Unlike most studies of juvenile offenders, which focus only on understanding the causes of individuals' criminal behavior, ours is examining the interconnections among antisocial behavior, psychological development, mental health, education, work, family life, substance use, and the receipt of social services.

Young people who are in the justice system are there as a result of their violation of the law. But our research, as well as that conducted by other teams, shows that the population of juvenile offenders is defined by more than their illegal or antisocial behavior. A disproportionate number of juvenile offenders have had contact with the foster care system sometime during childhood. A disproportionate number have been abused or neglected. A disproportionate number require special education. A disproportionate number suffer from substance abuse or dependence. A disproportionate number have a mental illness such as depression, post-traumatic anxiety disorder, or bipolar illness. In other words, these young people, whom we classify as juvenile offenders, could just as easily be classified as special education students, victims of child abuse, alcoholics, or youngsters with affective disorder. Yet, because of artificial categorization based on funding streams and programs, we classify these adolescents as juvenile offenders, and not in some other, equally valid way, and because the juvenile justice, education, mental health and child welfare systems do not always coordinate their efforts, adolescents in the justice system often do not receive the full range of services that they need, either while they are in facilities or when they return to the community, during periods of aftercare. As a consequence, many juvenile offenders continue to commit crimes after they have been released from the justice system. In our ongoing study, for instance, we are finding that one of the best predictors of re-offending is having an alcohol or substance use disorder. To effectively help adolescents overcome challenges we need the programs and services available to them to be coordinated holistically, not categorically.

Our work suggests that in order to understand how best to prevent and respond to juvenile crime, we need to look at the whole adolescent, and not just at that young person's antisocial behavior. I am confident that if you were to ask experts who work in the fields of education, workforce development, health care, mental health, or foster care, you would receive a similar assessment.

America needs an overarching youth policy in order to promote positive development and prevent problematic functioning during this critical period of life. Requiring agencies that serve youth to work together toward the common goals that they all share—helping young people have a positive and successful adolescent experience and helping to ensure that they make a healthy and successful transition to adulthood—is a critically important element in the development of an overarching youth development policy. The Federal Youth Coordination Act is an important step in the right direction.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. That was awesome. Thank you all for very, very good testimony.

I am a proud sponsor of this bill and congratulate Congressman Osborne for bringing folks together to have this debate.

I want to touch on an issue that my colleague from Ohio brought up. You all may have heard him bring it up to our previous witness, Dr. O'Grady, that being music.

Let me put it in this context. Having grown up in a family where English was the second language when I was growing up, graduating from the second largest public school system in Ohio, first in my family to graduate from high school, eligible for the free and reduced lunch program when I was in high school, if it weren't for music for me, I can tell you that I would certainly not be here, but who knows where I would be if it weren't for that wonderful mentor/teacher and a music program that really got me interested more than other things I was involved in. I am still involved in music today.

Taking Mr. Ryan's lead in his question earlier to Dr. O'Grady, how do we from a Federal policy standpoint maybe try to help youth who might come from difficult backgrounds get interested in music, sports, or other particular programs that might help them through adolescence?

Ms. SALLEE. One comment I would make is if we were really comprehensive in expecting every young person to have a good thing to do after school, after school activities including mentors, youth service opportunities.

What do they do when they are not in school? We recently did a survey of 2,000 young people, and unfortunately, 75 percent have nothing to do and surf the Internet. That is a great opportunity begging for a solution. They need mentors. They need music. They need sports. They need productive activities. They need volunteer opportunities.

We need to take again a coordinated approach to this thing and make sure that every young person has something good to do after school.

Dr. STEINBERG. May I add to that, we now know from behavioral science research that the hours between 3 in the afternoon and 6 in the evening are the prime time for youngsters' experimentation with drugs and alcohol, precocious sexual activity, and delinquency.

If we could occupy young people in the after school hours with these more productive activities that would help create a passion for something important in their lives, we could also prevent a lot of problem behavior at the same time.

Mr. MOORE. I would echo the thought particularly on developing positive opportunities for all kids throughout our nation.

Kids who are already enmeshed in the system either through mental health or substance abuse or delinquency, the interventions that we provide to them also need to be looking at that person as someone who is growing and still developing, and we need to make sure they have those kinds of opportunities as well, and that would be in addition to the supervision and other kinds of interventions that are needed in those cases, if such exist.

It is not just the prevention side that those things need to be brought to bear on the kids.

Ms. SHUBILLA. I guess I would just add music spoke to you. Community service spoke to me. I think that part of what we want to

create is opportunities to engage kids with things that are interesting to them, and for young people who have become particularly disengaged, it is the first way to get them back in the door and give them some success and some confidence that then helps them tackle some other issues in their life. I think it is very important.

Chairman TIBERI. Good point. Thank you. Thank you all. Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also want to thank you all for your testimony and your insights.

Ms. Sallee, you indicated that it did not appear to you that we had a focal point or a focus on youth or our young people. Are you suggesting a separate agency or designation of something coming out of the Federal Government that just simply concentrates on the problems, needs, hopes and aspirations of young people?

Ms. SALLEE. Thank you. The purpose of the Federal Youth Coordination Act would actually set up a council, and that council would represent all these different agencies that are serving young people today, and the very act of having a council and asking them to have a plan and to have measurable goals and to hold these different programs accountable and call for an assessment of young people and their needs, there are some people who said will this create an unnecessary level of bureaucracy, but in point of fact, this coordination could eliminate a lot of bureaucracy and get better results and a better return for our precious investment of real Federal money.

That would be, I think, the major thrust of this piece of legislation, to create this council that could become the focal point and have representation from the different groups and agencies.

Mr. DAVIS. The council could really do it? I mean we have commissions and study groups and all kinds of groups.

It seems to me that you are kind of moving toward an agency. I am thinking how programs come. Often times, one agency may very well not know what another agency is really doing.

If you have put all of the activity in a place, then somebody knows you are dealing specifically with youth. That may be separate from dealing with education or dealing with health care.

I guess there is some—

Ms. SALLEE. The representation from those different groups you listed would be at the table. The two good things about this Act is No. 1, it is over in 5 years. I like the sunset provision because it gives a sense of urgency. It says let's make a plan and let's institutionalize better coordination and better expectations.

Second, it also has provisions for going down to the state level, which can then help really organize at the state and community level, and that is real services and real kids live.

Mr. DAVIS. Dr. Steinberg, I really appreciate the intent and the focus of your study. It seems to me that what you found already, that we are on the right track with Representative Osborne's legislation.

How can your study or the information help us to become more effective at determining what is working and what is not working, and what really helps us get to the end result?

What is it that we are hoping is going to happen as a result of the activity in which we are engaged?

Dr. STEINBERG. Our study was designed to answer the very question that you are asking, that is what works for what kids under what circumstances.

I think that in order to answer that question, we need to take this broad holistic view of children and understand the different kinds of social and emotional and behavioral needs that they have.

Just as an aside, we have had a lot of difficulty getting other agencies to help support this research because it is seen as a juvenile justice study when in fact we are learning an awful lot about substance abuse and mental health and adolescent development and education and labor force participation.

Currently, there is not an effective mechanism for bringing together different agencies to fund research that is going to inform the study of these issues in the kind of comprehensive way that we need.

I am hoping that with provisions such as those outlined in the Act that Mr. Osborne has sponsored, it will not only help in the delivery of services and programs, but it will help us do a better job as a research community in evaluating and understanding the problems that kids have and what we need to do to address them.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you very much.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Mr. Osborne.

Mr. OSBORNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank those of you on the panel for appearing here today.

I would like to start with Ms. Sallee. I think you mentioned \$223 billion spent on 125 programs or 150, whatever. That is a huge amount of money.

I wondered if you had available quickly the comment in your testimony where you quoted the young lady was somewhat frustrated by her experience in the system? I have it here. I can read it for you if you don't have it accessible.

Ms. SALLEE. Yes, please.

Mr. OSBORNE. Anyway, what you said is I'm sure the Federal agencies are doing the best they can, but there is no coordination. You have to go to one place for health care and run to another place for unemployment and somewhere else for education, and all around town, fill out all kinds of forms, and one person just told me about the programs together. If I would have gone to get health care or emergency food stamps, at 18 years old, I don't even know how to use them and had no place to put them. If someone would have told me about the Federal transitional living program that was four miles away from where I was living in the hospital, I could have saved a year of homelessness.

The reason I am asking this is you folks deal with people in real life situations and on the ground, so to speak.

As we listened to Dr. O'Grady, and I think his testimony was excellent, we get the impression that things are really going pretty well, and as we listen to you folks, I don't have quite the same impression.

There is a little disconnect here. I wondered—I will throw it open to any and all of you—where do you think the situation lies? Where does the rubber hit the road?

I do not want to introduce legislation that is meaningless or duplicative and doesn't do any good.

I guess in my experience, I ran a mentoring program with 3,000 kids, and as I deal with young people, I don't think things are going all that well. I do see a lot of confusion, and most kids in foster care are dealing with at least four or five different agencies and it is very confusing. Unless they have a lot of help, they just simply can't negotiate the system.

Anyway, would you flesh it out a little bit and what are the facts? Maybe you could say a little bit more on whether this is a good thing or a bad thing. What do you see happening on the ground with kids and young people?

Ms. SALLEE. I think all of us can reflect from our different perspectives the frustrations that we live and feel on behalf of young people we have tried to serve and help and their family members who can't negotiate the system and the different eligibility criteria and the different places you have to go just to put together the basic resources that you are trying to have to help your child or the family.

Then the workers themselves get frustrated because there are artificial barriers through these silos of funding streams that come down.

On behalf of the administration, I do think there has been an effort to introduce better coordinating vehicles, but I was suggesting in my summary testimony, we can't be dependent on one domestic policy advisor to work this through.

What we are all asking for is that this notion of coordination on behalf of young people and better results for young people and a more holistic view of young people, that that be institutionalized through this council and through this Coordination Act, and then maybe we can have this window of time to really break through some of these silos and create some better coordination and get more efficient use of the money.

If we had more efficient use of money, we could serve more kids. I think that's what we all are about, touching more lives.

Ms. SHUBILLA. I would just add to that, on a local level, we have been grappling with a similar issue. We have a lot of good people in place across all of our agencies right now who are eager and willing to work together.

How does that outlast the current leadership, the current political appointments that are in place to make sure this is institutionalized, so that every time there is new leadership, we are not starting all over again with our coordination efforts.

I think at the end of the day, that is what is going to make the difference in terms of returns on investment and being able to cut administrative costs, since this is a long term institutionalized system and not just a short lived system.

Mr. MOORE. From a state perspective, I will remind you that I do believe that the real coordination has to happen at the case level, locally, but at the state level, a number of the efforts that are going on in the administration are working in the right direction. They are doing things that make sense and that are smart.

The devil is in the details. By the time it gets down to the local community, sometimes it almost feels like a theoretical construct, what has happened at the Federal level.

An example would be there are some programs where there have been some joint Federal agencies working together to develop a program for after care, re-entry of offenders, for example. Wonderful ideas. Wonderful things. They are doing well.

The states are having to apply to a number of different agencies and fill out a number of different reports and deal with different Federal liaison, even though there are Federal agencies working together on a common project, there are still things that could be done to improve the coordination and the seamlessness of working together.

At the state level, we have the same problem, trying to do that for our local communities.

There is still work to be done.

Mr. OSBORNE. I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you. Mr. Ryan.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you. Ms. Sallee, I think you mentioned better coordination, the more efficient this is, the more money we could actually get down maybe to the case level and get actually help to these kids.

In your estimation and maybe in Mr. Moore's as well, what kind of savings do you think we could extract from this \$223 billion? That is a lot of money for any of us to even try to comprehend. Percentages, numbers.

Do you have any idea what money we would be able to save by coordinating this and actually pushing the money down to the kids?

Ms. SALLEE. I couldn't say because I think what you have to do is get everybody at the same table to say what can we do to serve these kids as holistic human beings, and let's see what happens.

I also would caution that this is not so much about saving money. When you think about our children as our future and how much money should we be investing in those young people and in our future, and you look at the challenges facing us globally, this is a big amount of money, but it is not too much to be investing in our children and our future.

I think what we are calling for as much as anything is better results for that money.

I agree there could be some efficiencies and some of those dollars could then serve more young people, but I think it would be tough to hazard a guess until you got everybody at the table, because that is part of the problem, even this White House Task Force report didn't know where the overlaps and the duplications were when they tried to analyze this problem.

We have to get the agencies at the Federal and state levels sitting at the same table to say how can we clear the clutter, get rid of the unnecessary paperwork, and take care of kids.

Mr. MOORE. I've been with state government for some time now, and I have seen lean times where budgets are cut tremendously and I have seen good times in terms of revenue.

I didn't come here today to try to help understand or help describe how much money we could save or how much money we need. I came here today to talk about how whatever money there is available, we can do better things with it.

Whatever money you give to the states, we are going to do as good as we can. Any additional help you can give us, other ways of coordinating and flexibility, so we can help local folks coordinate is what I think this discussion is about.

Mr. RYAN. I appreciate that. I agree. I think regardless of what the savings may be here, which I think can be significant, I still think 50 percent graduation rates and all the statistics that you have said, we have to make greater investments.

I think we owe an obligation to the taxpayer to make sure that this is invested properly and efficiently and everything else.

I think you guys bring up some great points not only with youth development. Congressman Osborne, this is terrific. I hope this can be a model for what we do with health care and what we do with a lot of other things in Government, to look at this as a system.

We do the same thing in the schools. We have junk food in the schools and candy and pop and everything else, and then we wonder why many years later these kids have certain diseases or are susceptible to certain diseases.

I think this is a good opportunity for us to have this broader discussion. I thank you very much.

One question for Dr. Steinberg. Maybe you can help us understand, too, and we talked about music, and the Chairman talked about music and the arts and they are what I think will end up being a great opportunity for all of us to figure out what the mental health and abused kids—I know a family that has three kids, all grew up in a terrible environment. Two are in sports. One is in speech, debate, drama and music.

By far, the one who is in drama and music is much healthier emotionally than I think the others are.

Why is that? Why are these studies coming out that music and music therapy and these kinds of things—why are the arts effective in this regard?

Dr. STEINBERG. I think it just may be the case for that family. Lots of kids do very well in athletic activities. Others don't connect with sports but connect more with music or art.

I think the key point is that we need to provide opportunities for all kids to connect to something, and that is what is going to make a difference in keeping them healthy and helping them make a successful transition into adulthood.

We don't fund music and arts as much as we ought to, and they are certainly not as well funded as athletic activities are, and that is a problem that we need to address.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear, I don't play a musical instrument. I don't sing. I don't dance. I don't do anything.

I see a trend happening with kids who are provided with that opportunity and others who are not.

I thank you very much. I think this is great. Mr. Osborne, thank you for doing this. This is wonderful.

Mr. Chairman, thanks for having the hearing.

Chairman TIBERI. Thank you, Mr. Ryan. So, it's not true about one of your colleagues from Ohio, what he says about you and your dancing?

[Laughter.]

Mr. RYAN. Not true.

Chairman TIBERI. Not true? OK.

Thank you, Mr. Osborne, for your leadership again. I want to thank the four of you for the time that you spent here today, the work that you are doing out in the field, your testimony. It was very helpful as we move forward.

I want to thank the Members for their time and participation today, and if there is no further business before us today, the Subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:08 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

